


THE LIBRARY.

FIELDING AND ANDREW MILLAR.

NDREW MILLAR, bookseller in the Strand, sometime domiciled 'over-against *St. Clement's Church*,' and latterly 'over-against *Catherine-street*,' is a rather shadowy personality. Considering that he published the works of Thomson and Fielding and Hume; that he ranked in his day with the Tonsons and Dodsleys and Strahans; that he was associated, like Richardson and Nourse, with the abortive 'Society for the Encouragement of Learning'—one might reasonably expect that some particulars of his reputable and lucrative career would be readily accessible. But apart from a few dispersed data in Nichols's 'Anecdotes,' a reference or two in Hume's letters and Fielding's 'Covent Garden Journal,' together with sundry dubious 'on-dits' derived from what Johnson, writing of Mallet, calls the 'unauthorised loquacity of common fame,' there is little on which to base a biographical sketch. Almost the only definite record of his doings is contained in an account of his presence, late in life, at the 'Harrigate-water' of 'Humphry Clinker.' But from Johnson's declaration that

178 FIELDING AND ANDREW MILLAR.

Millar had 'raised the price of literature,' and from the great man's further assertion that—as contrasted with the patrician patron of letters—Millar was the true 'Maecenas of the age,' it may safely be inferred that he occupied a memorable, if uncelebrated position as an eighteenth-century publisher, while his acquirement of a large fortune in 'lawful money of Great Britain,' affords conclusive proof that he was abnormally prosperous. It is here intended to dwell for a moment on Millar's financial relations with Fielding, to whom he paid a considerable sum, and to whose sons he left a substantial legacy.

These relations, as far as can be ascertained, begin with the publication of 'Joseph Andrews' in February, 1742. Fielding was then five-and-thirty; and Millar, who had come to London from Scotland some dozen years earlier, was the same age. How they first became acquainted is obscure. But, failing express information, that 'unauthorised loquacity of common fame' of which Johnson speaks, conveniently interposes with an anecdote which, if manifestly inaccurate in detail, is, at least, 'ben trovato' in itself. According to this, which is said to be contained in Partington's British 'Cyclopædia of Biography,' Fielding, suffering more acutely than usual from the eternal want of pence which vexes public men, had left his manuscript on approval with an unnamed bookseller, who was hesitating to purchase it out and out for the contemptible sum of £25. While the matter was still pending, the disconsolate author

¹ Lawrence's 'Life of Fielding' 1855, 164*n*.

FIELDING AND ANDREW MILLAR. 179

happened to meet Thomson, of whose poems Millar was the publisher; and Thomson, whom Millar had by this time accustomed to more generous payments than those of his first publisher, Millan, at once advised him to get back his 'copy.' This was an easy matter; and Thomson—the story goes—forthwith carried Fielding to Millar, with whom (on the the advice of Mrs. Millar!) a bargain was eventually concluded. There are no traditions of any special friendship between Fielding and Thomson, in whose sensitive mind the 'O Huncamunca, Huncamunca O!' with which Fielding had parodied Thomson's unlucky lapse in 'Sophonisba,' might reasonably be supposed to rankle. But it is not incredible that there is some partial basis for so circumstantial a narrative; and it is an indubitable fact that Millar issued 'Joseph Andrews.'

Here, fortunately, we are on firmer ground than the evidence of a romancing book of reference, and a plainly-manipulated record.¹ Fielding's deed of assignment of 'Joseph Andrews' to Andrew Millar, although of necessity unknown to the contributor to Partington's 'Cyclopædia,' is extant in the Forster Collection at the Victoria and Albert Museum. It is entirely in Fielding's handwriting, and is signed with the old 'ff' he generally used. To make it more interesting, one of the two witnesses to his signature is the 'Parson Abraham Adams' of the novel, the Rev. William Young,

¹ Partington's anecdotist—it should be noted—tells the story of 'Tom Jones'! But in 1749, when that book first appeared, Thomson was dead; and Millar was already the publisher of its predecessor.

that pugnacious and preoccupied curate of East Stour, who, if we may rely on recent investigations,¹ was in reality rather the faulty sketch than the finished model of the author's elaborated parish priest and schoolmaster. In whatever environment the deed originated—and Partington's decorative chronicler of course supplies the conventional tavern libations—its terms and language have an ultra-legal particularity which would have delighted the circuitous soul of Wilkins Micawber. It is dated 13th April, 1742,² when all men are to know, by these presents, that Henry Fielding, of the Inner Temple, Esq., for and in consideration of the sum of one hundred and ninety-nine pounds, six shillings, of lawful money of Great Britain to him in hand paid by Andrew Millar of St. Clement Danes in the Strand, Bookseller, has bargained, sold, delivered, assigned and set over all his 'Title, Right and Property in and to a certain Book printed in two volumes known and called by the Name and Title of *The History of the Adventures of Joseph Andrews and of his Friend Mr. Abraham Adams written in Imitation of the Manner of Cervantes, Author of Don Quixotte.*' The above sum of £199 6s.—the assignment proceeds to say—includes payment for a farce, 'Miss Lucy in Town,' and a pamphlet, 'A Vindication of the Duchess of Marlborough—the price of the farce being £10 10s., and that of the pamphlet £5 5s. The

¹ 'Notes and Queries,' 18th March, 1916, p. 224.

² The book, it will be noted, had, at this date, been already issued. But, as in the later case of 'Tom Jones,' payment, no doubt, had preceded publication.

exact sum paid for the copyright of 'Joseph Andrews' was consequently £183 11s., about three times as much as Goldsmith obtained, twenty years later, for the 'Vicar of Wakefield.' For the first effort of an untried novelist, however, it was not an illiberal offer; but, as Mr. Saintsbury observes, 'it will be admitted that "Joseph Andrews" was not dear.' A second edition, revised and corrected, appeared in the year of publication (1742), and a third, 'illustrated with cuts' (i.e. copper plates) by James Hulett, in the year following. There is no record, that, on this occasion, the author received any supplementary payment from his publisher; and 'Tom Jones' had probably been already issued when the fourth edition, again 'revised,' made its appearance in 1749.

Fielding's next work was a translation of the 'Plutus' of Aristophanes, in collaboration with William Young. This was not issued by Millar, and—looking to the 'distressed, and at present, declining State of contemporary Learning,'¹ notwithstanding the heroic efforts of a Society of 'Gentlemen of Letters and High Life' to galvanize it into vitality—that prudent personage was probably well advised in refraining from embarking in the new undertaking, if, indeed, it was ever proposed to him. The book was put forth in June, 1742, by T. Waller of the Temple Cloisters; and can scarcely have been successful, since it was never followed up by the further versions of which it was proclaimed to be the pioneer. Probably little but the Preface was by Fielding, who never

¹ Dedication to Lord Talbot.

pretended to be 'far seen in Greek.' '*Tuscan* and *French* are in my Head; *Latin* I write, and *Greek* I—read,' he says in his verses to Sir Robert Walpole. 'Parson Adams,' on the other hand, was a finished Grecian, and edited the *Lexicon of Hedericus*.¹ After the '*Plutus*' comes the '*Miscellanies*' of 1743, in three volumes. With this Millar was only indirectly concerned, as the first edition was printed by subscription for the author, and Millar only sold it. The second edition, issued in the same year, has, however, no subscription list, and is 'Printed for A. Millar.' Millar also published Sarah Fielding's novel of '*David Simple*,' for the second edition of which Fielding wrote a Preface. This came out in 1744, by which date Millar had apparently moved from his first shop near St. Clement's Church to a new one 'opposite *Katherine-street* [*sic*], in the *Strand*.' Whether this was the *Shakespear's Head* once occupied by the elder Tonson is not clear, as—according to Nichols—the former shop of Tonson the first was still tenanted by Tonson the third.² With Fielding's two anti-Jacobite papers, the '*True Patriot*,' 1745-6, and the '*Jacobite's Journal*,' 1747-8, Millar had no concern; but Fielding contributed a second Preface to his sister's new book, the '*Familiar Letters between the Principal Characters in David Simple*,' 1747, which he further enriched by five epistles of his own.

Meanwhile, during this seemingly barren period,

¹ There are two of his Greek epigrams in the '*St. James's Magazine*' for February, 1763.

² '*Literary Anecdotes of the Eighteenth Century*,' 1812, i, 297.

FIELDING AND ANDREW MILLAR. 183

at Bath, at Salisbury, and possibly at the newly identified London house in Boswell Court, St. Clement Danes,¹ the masterpiece of 'Tom Jones,' like the fame of Marcellus, was growing silently. We have Fielding's own assurance (Book xi, ch. i) that it had employed 'thousands of Hours in the composing'; and we are also informed in the Dedication that it represents the labours of some years of his life. Much of the latter part of it must have been written at Back Lane, Twickenham, his summer residence previous to his appointment, at the end of 1748, as a Bow Street magistrate. In the preceding June he was doubtless in sight of port, for the receipt he gave to Andrew Millar on the 11th of that month describes it as 'the History of a Foundling in Eighteen Books.' It was to make six volumes duodecimo, and in consideration of Six Hundred Pounds for the sole Copyright, he was to assign the work to Millar on demand. The subsequent deed to this effect, which is dated the 25th of March, 1749, closely follows that of 'Joseph Andrews' in its terms. It is in clerical script. The signature is witnessed by Fielding's faithful clerk, Joshua Brogden; and it is apparently sealed with the double-headed Austrian eagle seal he habitually employed.² At the date of the assignment 'Tom Jones' was already on sale, having been published on the 28th of February preceding; and unlike 'Joseph Andrews,' which was anonymous, its

¹ 'Notes and Queries,' 1st April, 1916, p. 264.

² The receipt and assignment were long in the Huth Library. They were sold at Sotheby's in June, 1911, for £1,015, Mr. Henry Huth having paid Sotheran £12 12s. for them in 1868.

title page proclaimed it to be 'by Henry Fielding, Esq.' The deed also confirmed Millar's change of residence by describing him as of the Parish of St. Mary-le-Strand, whereas his former shop had been in the Parish of St. Clement Danes.

Millar, though he relied largely on his advisers in selecting the manuscripts he published, was a master of the minor trade devices for putting his wares upon the market. In his first announcement of 'Tom Jones' ('General Advertiser,' 28th February, 1749) the public were ingenuously informed that, as it was 'impossible to get Sets bound fast enough to answer the Demand for them, such Gentlemen and Ladies as pleased, might have them sew'd in Blue Paper and Boards at the Price of 16s. a Set.' Of the book, as it first appeared, there were certainly two six-volume issues: one, which had at the beginning a goodly list of 'Errata' to the first five volumes; the other, in which the misprints are nearly all corrected and the list is omitted. The first set, with the leaf of 'Errata,' is consequently of most interest to the collector, being, in fact, the true 'editio princeps.' Later, in 1749, came another edition, in four volumes, to be followed in 1750 by yet another, containing the author's final corrections. But perhaps the best proof of the popularity of the book is to be found in Horace Walpole's letter to George Montagu of 18th May, 1749, in which he writes: 'Millar the bookseller has done very well by him [Fielding]; finding "Tom Jones," for which he had given him six hundred pounds, sell so greatly, he has since given him another hundred.' With the

editions of 'Tom Jones' printed after Fielding's death, it is here needless to linger. Between the dates of the publication of the first edition and the publication of a third novel, 'Amelia,' the only important work Fielding put forth through Millar was the 'Enquiry into the causes of the late Increase of Robbers,' etc., 1751, a pamphlet which, with his friend Hogarth's terrible 'Gin Lane,' had the credit of contributing not a little to the passing of the subsequent Act for restricting the sale of spirituous liquors. But this belongs less to his work as a writer of fiction than to his philanthropic and magisterial efforts.

These, strenuous and exacting as they were, did not fail to colour the opening pages of 'Amelia,' which appeared in December, 1751, though by anticipation, it bore the date of 1752. It was in four books and four volumes; and no assignment of it is known to exist—if ever there was one. As in the case of 'Tom Jones,' the title page declares it to be by Henry Fielding, Esq.; and the Preface is dated 'Bow Street, 12th December, 1751.' Andrew Millar's address is simply the Strand, as in the later 'Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon.' Following his usual practice, he employed the artful aid of advertisement to whet the public appetite. It was announced that 'to satisfy the earnest Demand . . . this Work has been printed at four Presses; but the Proprietor notwithstanding finds it impossible to get them [*sic*] bound in Time, without spoiling the Beauty of the Impression, and therefore will sell them sew'd at Half-a-Guinea.'

As regards an additional expedient he adopted, it may be well to quote Sir Walter Scott. Writing his Preface to Fielding's 'Works' in October, 1820, for the opening volume of Ballantyne's 'Novelist's Library,' he says:

Millar published 'Amelia' in 1751. He had paid a thousand pounds for the copyright; and when he began to suspect that the work would be judged inferior to its predecessor, he employed the following stratagem [illiberal critics would use a harsher name!] to push it upon the trade. At a sale made to the booksellers, previous to the publication, Millar offered his friends his other publications on the usual terms of discount; but when he came to 'Amelia,' he laid it aside, as a work in such demand, that he could not afford to deliver it to the trade in the usual manner. The *ruse* succeeded, the impression was anxiously bought up, and the bookseller relieved from any apprehension of a slow sale.¹

Sir Walter's version of the circumstances has been generally accepted without question. But it has been pointed out to me by an unusually acute and well-informed student of Fielding, Mr. Frederick S. Dickson of New York,² that there is an earlier account of the transaction which is also entitled to consideration. In Sir Nathaniel Wraxall's 'Memoirs,' which it is suggested Scott may have had in mind, and which appeared in two volumes

¹ 'Lives of the Novelists,' Galignani's reprint, 1825, i, 35.

² Mr. Dickson is an enthusiastic Fielding collector who has given more than a thousand volumes by and concerning the novelist to the Yale University Library. In 1907 he edited Keightley's valuable Fielding papers in 'Fraser's Magazine' for the Rowfant Club of Cleveland, Ohio—a volume which includes a careful investigation by himself of the first issues of 'Tom Jones.'

in 1815, it is affirmed on the authority of Millar's apprentice and successor Thomas, or 'Alderman' Cadell, that Millar only gave £800 for 'Amelia.' That, having bought it, he showed it to Sir Andrew Mitchell, later British Envoy to Frederick the Great. Sir Andrew, though he admitted it to be 'a fine performance,' considered it much inferior to 'Tom Jones,' and recommended Millar 'to get rid of it as soon as he could,' which he proceeded to do by adopting what Scott characterises as the 'stratagem' above referred to. Wraxall's reputation for accuracy, after the attacks of Croker and Mackintosh, is somewhat fly-blown; but in this case, his story has a look of verisimilitude. What is more, his 'Memoirs' were published by Cadell's son, who should have been cognisant of the facts. On the other hand, it is by no means impossible that Scott may have obtained his information independently, and that his excellent memory did not fail him as to the amount. But there, unless an assignment for 'Amelia' comes to light, the matter must probably rest. It has also been observed that Johnson's statement (which reaches us through the not-always-trustworthy Mrs. Thrale) to the effect that a new edition of 'Amelia' was called for on the day of publication, is open to the objection that there was apparently no further reprint of the book until the complete works were published by Millar in 1762, eight years after Fielding's death. But Johnson—assuming him to have been correctly reported—probably only intended to imply that all the first impression was promptly taken up by the trade. Its actual distribution to purchasers

over the counter was admittedly a more leisurely process. 'The piece . . . is as dead as if it had been published forty years ago, as to sale,' wrote the jealous and jubilant Richardson to Miss Donellan, under date of 22nd February, 1752. And we know that Fielding himself, in the eighth number of the 'Covent Garden Journal,' complained bitterly of the rancorous treatment his 'favourite Child' had received at the hands of the public.¹

With the 'Covent Garden Journal,' which followed close upon 'Amelia,' Millar had nothing to do, though in the undignified Paper War it inaugurated,² he is occasionally mentioned as a general officer, and his publications were freely advertised in its columns. Beyond one or two pamphlets, he published nothing more of Fielding's except the posthumous 'Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon.' Of this, two differing editions were issued in 1755,³ the second, or fuller version of which is followed in the 'Complete Works' of 1762. To the 'Journal,' as is well known, was added the 'Fragment of a Comment on Lord Bolingbroke's Essays,' which

¹ See 'The Covent Garden Journal: Being a hitherto-unwritten Chapter in the Life of Henry Fielding,' in the present writer's 'Side-Walk Studies,' 1902, pp. 63-92.

² This conflict, originally treated in part by Isaac d'Israeli, has recently been dealt with at length by Dr. G. E. Jensen, of Philadelphia, in his scholarly reprint of the 'Covent Garden Journal,' 1916. Such a course is perhaps demanded in a special treatise of the kind; but, in Fielding's biography, Scott's wise words are our best comment: 'Neither party would obtain honour by an enquiry into the cause or conduct of its hostilities.' ('Lives of the Novelists,' 1825, i, 36.)

³ There is a minute collation of these two versions by the late Colonel W. F. Prideaux in 'Notes and Queries' for 28th July, 1906.

had occupied the last months of Fielding's life. Millar, shrewd as he was, had narrowly escaped being a heavy loser by 'St. John's fell genius.' Anticipating that his Lordship's utterances would be of unusual interest to the freethinking world, he had offered Mallet, Bolingbroke's executor, a bait of three thousand pounds for the copyright. Fortunately for him, Mallet refused, preferring in his over-reaching cupidity, to publish at his own risk, with the result that, in short space, he was compelled to borrow from Millar, in order to pay his printer and stationer. Moreover, it was fully twenty years before his first edition, in five quarto volumes, became completely exhausted.

In the 'Journal of a Voyage to Lisbon,' Millar is not out of mind, since he was one of the consignees of the two hogsheads of South Hams cider which Fielding bought at Torbay as a present for the friends he had left behind him. In 1763, a year after the publication of Fielding's complete works, we get a glimpse of Millar at Harrogate, which then was held to afford 'the best entertainment of any watering-place in Britain, at the least expense.' Here he appears as an unpretentious personage in well-worn morning clothes, whom the 'baronets and great squires,' probably from his resemblance to a character in Murphy's 'Upholsterer,' nicknamed 'Peter Pamphlet,' but nevertheless courted assiduously on account of the two newspapers which reached him punctually by every post. He was accompanied by a city wife and niece, who seem to have been shy of acknowledging their plainly-clad protector—except when it became a

question of paying for 'extras' at the shilling ordinary. But they, in their turn, did not escape being laughed at by the more fashionable frequenters of the Wells.¹ In 1767 Millar retired from business in favour of his old apprentice, Thomas Cadell, who, from 1765, had been his partner. On the 8th of June, 1768, he died at Kew, to which neighbourhood he had at first moved years before to be near his compatriot, Thomson, for whom he had a sincere regard; and who spoke of him affectionately as 'good-natured, obliging Millar.' In his will, which was made on the 20th February, 1768, and proved in the following June, he bequeathed £200 to 'David Hume, the historian and philosopher, now in London'; £200 each to Fielding's sons, William and Allen, and £50 (for a ring) to Sir Andrew Mitchell, then in Berlin. He was also considerate enough to direct that his inexpensive funeral, 'not to exceed £50,' should, contrary to custom, take place in daylight, to save his friends from exposure to 'night-damp by which so many are injuriously affected.' He lies under an obelisk in the Chelsea burying-ground, where he had a family vault. His children, three in number, had all died in infancy. His fine-lady widow, who survived him twenty years, and to whom he left an ample fortune, became, in 1770, the fourth wife of Sir Archibald Grant, Bart., of Monymusk, Aberdeenshire, one of the earliest patrons of William Hogarth.

AUSTIN DOBSON.

¹ 'Autobiography of Dr. Alexander Carlyle' ('Jupiter Carlyle'), 1860, 2nd edition, p. 432.

THE BOOK TRADE IN WINCHESTER, 1549-1789.

EXTRACTS FROM THE LOCAL RECORDS OF THE CITY.

THE following extracts have been taken, with one or two exceptions, from that portion of the City Records housed in the Winchester Public Library. I am gathering together material relating to printing and the book trade in Winchester, and I thought that these excerpts from our local records might be of interest to bibliographers as a contribution to the history of provincial printing. The entries are arranged in chronological order, the source of each entry being indicated in the notes.

A. CECIL PIPER (City Librarian).

1549-51. ¹	For a 100 weight of parchment books sold for	
	6s the 100 weight	6 . 0
	For half a 100 weight of like books	3 . 0

1551-4. ¹	Pd. for books, vestments and other things	
	belonging to the Church	£4 . 2 . 3

1556. ¹	For Books to the Church	£1 . 17 . 0
--------------------	-------------------------	-------------

¹ Churchwardens' Accounts of St. John the Baptist at Hill in the Soke.

1566. ¹	Harry Crocker, of the Soke, Bookbynder, paid £3.6.8 to be released of all offices save Maior.	
1567. ²	Quire of paper for Council House	4d
	do. do.	6d
	Book for Council House	1.0
1569. ³	A nomelly [homily] boke, bought vi of Marche	xd
1570. ³	A comynyon boke ye xxiv Julye	vis od
	A boke for ye mynystracion of ye Sacra- ment	iiii d
1572. ³	Ye Commandements bought ye xxv day of August	xi d
	A new Catechisseme boke	iii d
1588-9. ⁴	A quire of paper in Council House	iiii d
1590. ³	Bosses for ye Bible covers	vis od
1658. ⁵	The Town Clerk—S. Welstead, parchment and paper	4.0
	for a book to gather the City rents	7.0
	parchment and paper	4.6
	Nov. 26, parchment bought of Mr. Heade for City use	6.0

¹ List of Tradesmen.² Chamberlain's Roll of 1567.³ Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Peter Chesil.⁴ Chamberlain's Roll, 1588-9. ⁵ Chamberlain's Roll, 1658.

WINCHESTER, 1549-1789. 193

1667.¹ Mary and John, children of William Etheridge, or Egerege, parchment maker, died.

1725.² 14 August, 1725. Agreed and ordered at and by the same Assembly That Isaac James Philpott shall be permitted and allowed to use the Trades of a Printer and Bookseller within this City paying for a Fyne or Composition for such permission One pound one shilling he being not qualified by any means to use the said Trades without such Composition or allowance within this City.

1732.³ 20 December, 1732. Agreed and ordered att and by the same Assembly that Isaac James Philpott of this City Bookseller shall have £25 of Sr. Thomas White's gift He giving such good security for repayment thereof as shall be approved by the Mayor and Aldermen of this City.

1732.³ 20 December, 1732. Agreed and Ordered att and by the same Assembly That John Cole of this City Parchment maker shall have another of Sr. Thomas White's 25£ He giving such good security for repayment thereof as shall be approved of by the Mayor and Aldermen.

1734.³ 16 April, 1734. Agreed and ordered att and by the same Assembly That - Clarke Widow of William Clarke heretofore of this City Bookseller, Decd. shall have the Marks in the Room of Widow Walker decd. To Comence from Michas. last past.

¹ St. Maurice Registers.

² Ninth Book of Ordinances.

³ Tenth Book of Ordinances.

1741.¹ 13 March, 1741. Agreed and ordered at and by the same Assembly That William Colson of this City, Bookseller an Aged man and a person who heretofore lived in good Repute (tho' now gone to decay) shall be put and placed an Almsman in Christ's Hospitall in the room and place of one Elton decd. late one of the Brethren in the said Hospital.

1742.² August 6th, 1742
City of Winchester Debtor to Wm. Ayres, for Printing forty one Orders or Rules to be observed by the Attornies and Officers of the said City 01 . 01 . 00

Recd. 24th Decr. 1742 One pound one shilling by the hands of Mr. Robert Clarke in full of this Bill and all Demands upon the City By me Wm. Ayres.

1744.² Recive Feby. 25, 1744, of Mr. Thos. Wallden [Waldron] Mayor, ten shillings and sixpence, in full for Printing twelve Extra of Mr. Wayvels Will. Wm. Ayres.

1766-7.³ City Bill in the Mayortlys of Jas. White and N. P. Smith, Esqrs.

1766	To John Meaisey, Dr.	
Novr. ye 1st	To Printing 200 Follio advertisements	12 . 0
ye 10th	To Printing 200 Large Posting Broad Sides abstracts from an act of Parliament against fore-stallars, &c.	2 . 2 . 0

¹ Tenth Book of Ordinances.

² Mayor's Accounts.

³ Retrospect of Manners and Customs.

WINCHESTER, 1549-1789. 195

April ye 17th	To $\frac{1}{4}$ Hundd. fine office pens	1.0
Octr. ye 27th	To Printing 100 Large Posting Broad Sides abstracts from an act of Parliament against fore-stallors, &c.	1.12.6
1767		
Novr. ye 9th	To a large Follio Book To take Examinations in To Sand Wafers (?), &c.	10.6 1.6
		<hr/> 5.7.6

Recd. the 21st March 1768 of the
Worshipfull the Mayor and Aldermen
the Contents of the above Bill in full.
Pd. John Meaisey.

1773-4.¹ City of Winchester

1773	To John Wilkes Dr.	
Augt. 17th	1 large 4to Acct. Book	2.6
Octr. 12th	Printing 100 large 4to Tables of Price of Bread	7.6
1774		
Feb. 16th	Printing 100 Bills to forbid Cockscailing	5.0
April 16th	1 small Com. Prayer, for swearing	1.6
	6 small Evangelists, for Do.	9.0
		<hr/> 1.5.6

Receivd. Decr. 20th of the Worshipful
the Mayor and Aldermen of this City,
the Contents in full. J: Wilkes.

¹ Retrospect of Manners and Customs.

1778-80.¹ City of Winchester.

1778	To J. Wilkes.	
Decr. 10	To Printing 100 Passes	10.0
1779		
Feby. 8	To an Alphabet	2.0
	To Printing folio Bills to forbid Inoculation	12.0
	To Advertizing do.	10.0
	To Advertizing to Contradi ^t the Report of an Epidemic disorder in London Evening three times	15.0
	To do. three times in the Salisbury Journal	15.0
	To do. three times in the Hampshire Chronicle	15.0
Sepr. 6	To printing 400 Bills	12.0
1780		
Feby.	To Advertizing Goods Stolen	10.0
		<hr/> 5.1.0 <hr/>

Receivd. Feb. 18, 1780, of Mr.
Aldm. White, the Contents in full.
J. Wilkes.

1783.¹

St. Margaret's Chyard. [Westmr.].
Octr. 8, 1783.

Dear Sir,

This afternoon my son carried Mr.
Penton's Acts to the Winton Carrier at the
Rose, Holborn Bridge, when his waggon was
unloading, so I make no doubt you will
receive 'em safe. Tho King's Printer has

¹ Retrospect of Manners and Customs.

WINCHESTER, 1549-1789. 197

kept 'em a Month later than usual; but he is
a Member of Parlt. and as such, can take
what Liberty he pleases.

From, Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,
Joseph ffox.

1789.¹ The Chamber of Winton.

1789	To Thomas Blagden.	
Feb. 4	A Proposal Book, rough calf Lettd.	£0. 15. 0
May 10	Printing 400 Bills respecting the Canal Business	0. 10. 0
		<hr/>
		1. 5. 0

Exd. Js. White, Mayor.

To Mr. Holliss

Receiv'd the Contents

(Sep. 17, 1789). Thos. Blagden.

¹ Complete Sets of Chamberlain's Accounts.

THE MANUSCRIPTS OF SHAKESPEARE'S PLAYS.¹

IN our last paper we tried to reconstruct, in a reasonable and human manner, the story of how the Company of Players to which Shakespeare belonged met, as best they could, the successive attempts to pirate his plays. We found them after each piracy trying to protect certain plays, presumably those which they were then acting, by causing them to be entered on the Stationers' Register, so that no pirate should be able to obtain the copyright of them. That these entries in several instances were not followed by the appearance of an edition seemed to justify us in believing that their sole object was to defeat the pirates. On the other hand when the company had in their possession plays still saleable, but not being performed, still more when the theatre was closed owing to plague, or the number of performances was restricted in deference to Puritan complaints, we held that it might have been good business to sell plays to the best advantage, more especially if the pirates had been busy and there was any uncertainty as to what plays they had got hold of. We submitted on these lines that the company sold during Elizabeth's reign and the first year of James I eight plays by

¹ A lecture delivered at Cambridge as Sandars Reader, November, 1915.

Shakespeare to friendly publishers, and in three other cases asserted their rights after a piracy by putting out better texts. After their position as the King's servants was secured they were only induced by special reasons in each case to permit the publication of 'Lear' and 'Troilus,' and just before the appearance of the Folio of 1623 sanctioned a quarto edition of 'Othello.' Altogether they handed over to the printers the texts of fourteen plays. We have now to consider, from our bibliographical standpoint, what sort of texts these were, and what usually happened to a playwright's manuscript from the moment that it first left his hand to the time when it was used to light a fire or play some mysterious part in baking mackerel or lining a pie.

From the bibliographical standpoint a play of Shakespeare's is not a masterpiece of dramatic poetry, but so many sheets of paper with so much writing on them, by the aid of which actors had to say their words, and subsequently printers had to reproduce what the author wrote. After which, if the actors continued to say their words and the play was reprinted, more or less frequently, the bibliographer wants to know with what aids this process went on. When we have done our best by piecing together evidence from different quarters, and in default of evidence by supposing everyone to have taken as little trouble and gone to as little expense as possible, whatever story we are able to construct will at best be the story of an average or normal play, and how far it applies accurately to the case of any individual play or plays in which we are interested is a matter on which

there may or may not be specific evidence. We must walk humbly in this matter; but it is not humility but laziness to give up any attempt to reconstruct what happened, because the task is difficult and we know that we can only attain partial success. Every editor of an old text is constantly, whether he realizes it or not, making various assumptions as to what happened in its progress from manuscript to print and from one edition to another, and to force ourselves to think out the whole process should at least give us a keener perception as to whether our assumptions are bibliographically possible or impossible.

A playwright has written a play for the Chamberlain's men. It will be better not to call the playwright Shakespeare before we are obliged, because we so often unconsciously assume that Shakespeare must always have been regarded as a person of special importance and his writings have been in some way specially treated, whereas when his plays first began to be printed it was apparently not thought worth while to put his name on their title-pages. Our anonymous playwright then has sold a play to the Chamberlain's men. Was that manuscript likely to have been in his own handwriting or a scrivener's? If it had been written for the company which Henslowe exploited the scrivener would be ruled out by the fact that the playwright, or playwrights, would have been paid so little and that, not improbably, by small advances, that they would certainly have grudged the scrivener his fee. In the case of the Chamberlain's men, who paid better and attracted the best writers, the weightiest

objection to the scrivener would be the increased chance of piracy. If a scrivener were employed to make one copy, he might take the opportunity of making two. As it was, the players were exposed to some risks; for Greene was accused of having sold the same play to two different companies, and Heywood asserts that some playwrights reserved a copy to sell to the booksellers behind the players' backs. However, this may be, the scrivener would certainly have introduced a fresh possibility of loss.

As a basis for our doubts as to whether dramatists as a rule handed their plays to the companies in fair copies written for them by scribes, we are not restricted to these 'a priori' arguments. On 13th November, 1613, we find the industrious, but ever impecunious Daborne writing to Henslowe as to his tragedy on Machiavelli:

You accuse me with the breach of promise: trew it is I promysed to bring the last sceane, which that you may see finished I send you the fould sheet & the fayr I was wrighting, as your man can testify, which if great busines had not prevented I had this night fynished. . . . Howsoever I will not fayle to write this fayr and perfit the book, which shall not ly on your hands. ('Henslowe Papers,' ed. W. W. Greg, article 89, page 78.)

Here we see Daborne acting as his own copyist, making up the book of the play by instalments, as he found time, and sending his rough copy in advance when Henslowe grew impatient. It would be interesting to have this autograph manuscript and see what it looks like. Unfortunately it has not been preserved, but several plays by other contemporaries of Shakespeare have come

down to us in their authors' own handwriting, and when we examine some of these two very important points come to light: (i) that, contrary to what might have been expected, the players were able to obtain the verdict of the Master of the Revels as to whether a play might be publicly acted, or not, by submitting to him the play as written by the author, or authors, sometimes in pretty rough manuscript, and with passages written on slips and pasted in; and (ii) that, again contrary to what might have been expected, plays endorsed with the licence for their public performance were handed over to the prompter, and by him converted into prompt copies, without the 'play-house scrivener,' if such a person existed, being given a chance.

Among plays extant in the autograph of their author or authors may be instanced that of 'John à Kent and John à Comber,' by Anthony Munday (December, 1596) and 'Sir Thomas Moore,' by Munday, Dekker and others, *c.* 1600 (as to these two see Mr. Greg's note in the 'Modern Language Review,' viii 89), and Massinger's 'Believe as you List,' 1631. This last has the Licenser's permission for it to be acted endorsed on it, while 'Sir Thomas Moore' is also endorsed by the licenser, though the changes he required were so drastic that Mr. Greg is almost certainly right in believing that the idea of acting it had to be abandoned.

In the case of anonymous plays, or of plays by known authors where confrontation of an undoubted autograph and the handwriting of the play cannot be effected, our problem becomes very difficult and demands independent examination. We

have to recognize that an author, when he gives his mind to it, may be able to beat the scribes at their own craft. Thus Ben Jonson's autograph 'Masque of Queens' (Royal MS. 18. A. xlv) is a far neater manuscript than the scribe's version of his 'Tears of the Hours' (Royal 17 B. xxxi). On the other hand I have been taught lately during an examination of the fifteen plays in Egerton MS. 1994, to regard a complete lack of character in a handwriting and apparent absence of interest as a very promising beginning for an argument that a text had been handed over to a scribe. The main evidence for an anonymous play being autograph must be looked for in corrections in the same hand as the text which must be attributed to the author changing his mind, and evidence of this kind needs very careful weighing. For the present our examination of the plays in Egerton 1994 can only be cursory. Most, if not all of these were written, not only after Shakespeare's death, but after the publication of the First Folio. The majority of them show clear signs of having been used as prompt copies. Two, at least, had passed through the licenser's hands, viz., Heywood's 'The Captives' and a curious anonymous play in praise of the East India Company entitled 'The Lanchinge of the May or the Seaman's Honest Wife' (1633), and the former of these probably, and the latter certainly, from the character of the corrections, may be claimed as autograph. 'Dick of Devonshire' is doubtful. 'The Lady Mother,' attributed to Glapthorne, appears to be written by a scribe and corrected by the author. The 'Two Noble

Ladyes or the Converted Conjuror' appears to be autograph. 'Poore Man's Comfort,' attributed to Daborne in the printed edition of 1655, is not in Daborne's hand, despite his earlier habits. The 'Tragedy of Nero,' printed in 1624, is in several hands. As to other plays even a tentative opinion cannot be offered. Two in other manuscripts in the British Museum show clear signs of having passed through the licenser's hands. One of these, 'Sir John Barnevelt' (Add. 18653), attributed to Fletcher and Massinger, has a sidenote beginning 'I like not this,' signed G. B., i.e., Sir George Buc, while the 'Second Maidens Tragedy' in Lansdowne 807 owes its title to Buc, and bears his license for its representation dated 1611. Both manuscripts were undoubtedly afterwards used as prompt copies.

This being the best light we can obtain as to the theatrical custom, have we any special information in the case of Shakespeare's plays? As we have seen, a curious vein of pessimism has caused many scholars, especially during the last thirty years, to enlarge the reference, in the preface to the First Folio, to 'diuerse stolne and surreptitious copies' from a verifiable statement, that even such plays as had been maimed in the quartos were presented in sound texts, into a general accusation casting the slur of surreptitiousness on all the quartos indiscriminately. On the other hand, save as a peg on which Ben Jonson hung a characteristic criticism, very little importance seems to be attached to the remarkable statement at the end of the same paragraph which, after praise of Shakespeare as 'a happie imitator of Nature' and 'a most

gentle expresser of it,' proceeds 'His mind and hand went together: And what he thought he vttered with that easinesse, that wee haue scarce receiued from a him a blot on his papers.'

The importance of this statement, the justification for calling it remarkable, is that, if it has any meaning at all, it implies two things: first, that the Folio editors, as members of Shakespeare's Company, had received from him 'his papers,' i.e. autograph manuscripts of at least some of his plays; and secondly, that these autograph manuscripts were not 'fair copies,' such as Daborne and other authors were in the habit of delivering, but the text of the plays as he first wrote them down. Unless the papers were first drafts the claim made on Shakespeare's behalf on the ground of the absence of blots becomes ridiculous. The absence of blots from a scrivener's copy would prove nothing at all; therefore the papers must have been autograph. The absence of blots from an autograph 'fair' copy might be instanced as a proof of the writer's neatness, or accuracy, or willingness to take trouble, or even his affection for his fellows, and so forth; but by no logical gymnastics could it be quoted as a basis for the assertion that his mind and hand went together and what he thought he uttered with this 'easinesse' that is held up to admiration. Therefore, if the statement is to be allowed any meaning, the papers were not fair copies, but the original drafts.

The address in the First Folio 'to the great Variety of Readers,' from which we have been quoting, is a very tradesmanlike advertisement.

The book 'is now publique,' Heminge and Condell write, '& you will stand for your priuiledges wee know: to read and censure. Do so, but buy it first. That doth best commend a Booke, the Stationer saies. Then, how odde soeuer your braines be, or your wisedomes, make your licence the same, and spare not. Judge your fixe-pen'orth, your shillings worth, your siue shillings worth at a time, or higher, so you rise to the iust rates, and welcome. But, what euer you do, Buy. Censure will not driue a Trade, or make the Jacke go.'

This is poor enough stuff to offer some justification for regarding whatever follows as mere advertisement, and when we turn to the Dedication 'to the most noble and incomparable paire of Brethren,' the Earls of Pembroke and Montgomery, its heavy servility may confirm our ill impression. No doubt a handsome present was expected from the 'incomparable paire,' and the writers were ready to call Shakespeare's plays 'trifles' and make 'humble offer' of them to the dedicatees in order to get it. 'We haue observed,' they tell them naively, 'no man to come neere your Lordships but with a kind of religious address,' and customs having changed, their attempt to assume this 'religious' attitude repels us. But with a little sympathy we can understand both the advertisement and the obsequiousness, and arrive at a juster estimate of Heminge and Condell. The First Folio, with nearly a thousand pages of double-columned small type was a heavy venture for all concerned in it, and to obtain influential patronage and suggest to well-wishers quips by which they might shame

the recalcitrant into buying may have seemed necessary business precautions. They should not make us doubt the sincerity of the assurance that the editors had taken up their task 'without ambition either of selfe-profit or fame: onely to keepe the memory of so worthy a Friend & Fellow aliue, as was our Shakespeare.' There is a ring of real affection about this phrase, which makes it incredible that the men who used it should on the next page have picked out a literary characteristic of Shakespeare's only to lie about it. So when Heminge and Condell¹ write: 'His mind and hand went together: And what he thought he vttered with that easinesse, that we haue scarce receiued from him a blot on his papers,' we shall do well to believe that the autograph manuscripts of some at least of Shakespeare's plays had passed through the hands of Heminge and Condell, and that these contained the texts as they were first written down in the moment of composition.

On the authority of the editors of the First Folio we are thus justified in believing that Shakespeare, like Munday and Daborne and Massinger and other dramatists, brought his plays to the theatre in his own autograph. Heminge and Condell may only have seen the manuscripts of the later plays, but if Shakespeare avoided the scriveners when he was already rich and piracy had greatly abated, it is highly improbable that he

¹ Even if it should be proved beyond contradiction that the prefatory matter in the First Folio was written not by Heminge and Condell, but for them, the argument in this paragraph would hardly be affected, as a statement of this kind must surely have been inserted from their information.

employed them in his early days when the danger from piracy was much greater. In the absence of evidence to the contrary in the case of any individual play there is thus a bibliographical presumption that it reached the players in the author's original autograph manuscript.

But in the case of other plays we have examined we find that the original manuscript was taken to the Master of the Revels for his consent to its being publicly acted, and that when this consent was endorsed on it the same manuscript was used as a prompt-copy. If this course was followed in the case of Shakespeare's manuscripts our case is complete, for there is a considerable body of evidence, which is as strong as regards some of Shakespeare's plays as any others, that when a play was printed by anyone except a pirate, it was the text of the prompt-copy that was set up. The evidence consists in the survival of stage-directions of a certain kind, and to explain it we must set forth the different sources from which the annotations which we lump together under this general name, stage-directions, could take their rise.

In writing out a play, for his own convenience as well as that of the players, a dramatist would naturally insert exits and entrances, in order to show who at any moment was on the stage. He might also, though as to this there was no uniformity, describe any action with which the player was to accompany his words. Possibly in some cases, if he were familiar with the theatre, he might use the same technical language as a prompter, so that Shakespeare himself, in the scene

in the wood in the 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' may have written the directions, 'Enter a Faerie at one doore and Robin goodfellow at another,' 'Enter the King of Fairies at one doore, with his traine; and the Queen at another with hers,' the 'doors,' of course, being those of the stage, not of the wood. Moreover, as Mr. Greg has pointed out with reference to 'Sir Thomas Moore,' the playwright would be almost as likely as the prompter to substitute the name of the actor for whom a part had been written for that of the part itself. In any case, however, when the manuscript reached the playhouse the prompter would go over it and insert in the margin any further directions needed for the performance, more especially as to the provision of stage properties or as to music, shouts, knocks, or other noises to be made in the room behind the stage, which was compendiously indicated by the word 'within.' For our present purpose, if the author's manuscript became the prompt-copy, whether any given direction was made by author or prompter is all one.

When a play was put into print the prompter's notes, whether written by himself or the author, as distinct from the descriptive notes, should in all cases have been either omitted or translated into descriptive phrases. Fairly often, however, one or more in a play is printed in its original form, and thus betrays the nature of the copy from which the printed text was set up. Thus, in the 1599 Quarto of 'Romeo and Juliet,' although in Act I, Scene iv, we get the descriptive note 'Mufick playes and they dance,' later on in the play we get such

characteristic prompter's notes as 'Enter Romeo and Juliet aloft. Play Muficke'; or again, 'Enter Will Kemp' (the name of an actor, here substituted for his part), and 'Whistle boy.' So in the 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' besides the directions as to the 'doors' at which the fairies are to enter in the wood, in III, ii, 85 we find the prompter's reminder to Demetrius, 'Ly down.' So also in 'Much Ado about Nothing,' we find the names of the actors Kemp and Cowley, and in the 'Second Part of Henry IV' that of Sincklo, substituted for the characters they had to play.

In the plays first printed in the Folio, in those at the beginning of each of the three sections Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies, the prompter's notes have usually been edited away; but in other plays we find several instances of the substitution of actors' names for their parts, and 'within' is almost uniformly used for anything done behind the scenes, so that in the Porter's speech in 'Macbeth,' the note 'knocking within' is applied to Macduff's knocks on the outer gate. Also in the 'Second Part of Henry VI,' III, ii, 146, the prompter's note, 'Bed put forth,' reveals to us the primitive stage management, which thrust forth a bed, with Gloucester's body on it, into the middle of the stage, instead of having it ceremoniously brought in, according to the directions in modern editions, 'Exit Warwick' and 'Re-enter Warwick and Others bearing Gloucester's body on a bed.'

If, as has been shown, there is a high probability that the prompt-copy of any of Shakespeare's plays would be written in the author's autograph; and

if, as has also been shown, we know that the text of many of his plays, both of those printed in Quarto and of others which first appeared in the Folio of 1623, was derived from prompt copies, we can only escape from admitting the probability that some, at least of Shakespeare's plays were set up directly from his own manuscript by supposing that now at last the scrivener was given a job, and that a scrivener's copy intervened between the printer and Shakespeare's autograph.

It may be said in support of this supposition that if the players had handed over the actual prompt-copy to be printed they would have been left with no text of their own save such as could be reconstructed from the actors' parts. But the force of this objection is broken by the clear evidence which can be produced that copies of authorized Quartos were used in the theatre as prompt-copies. Thus, in the Folio text of 'Much Ado about Nothing,' set up from the Quarto of 1600, while the substitution of the names of the actors Kemp and Wilson for Dogberry and Verges is retained, in an earlier scene we find the name of Jack Wilson, the singing man of the company, freshly substituted for that of Balthasar, who has to sing 'Sigh no more, ladies.' In the same way, in the 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' for which the reprint of 1619 (dated 1600) was used for the Folio, this had clearly been used in the theatre, as two new and very obvious prompter's directions have crept in, namely in III. i. 116, 'Enter Piramus [i.e. Bottom] with the Asse head' (where only the prompter, who knew that there was only one Ass-head in the

playhouse stock of properties, would have written '*the Asse-head*' instead of '*an Ass-head*' as in modern editions), and again in V. i. 134, where the direction for the entry of the clowns is preceded by the note 'Tawyer with a trumpet before them.'

A Shakespeare Quarto could easily have been printed in a month if the printer employed a journeyman and a fairly advanced apprentice, so that if the players saw the superior convenience of a printed prompt-copy, and were not (as we may be sure) acting the plays at the time they sold them, no inconvenience would have arisen from their parting with their manuscript prompt-copy to the printer.

Another objection which suggests itself is that the players would be bound to keep in their archives the manuscript signed by the Master of the Revels, in case they should be challenged for departing from the text approved. This seems to ignore the easy temper of English officialdom at all periods. A Spanish censor must needs have a notary initial every page of the manuscript submitted to him. Tilney, or Buc, or Herbert were content to write their licence at the end of the manuscripts already altered and added to, in some cases with slips containing additions pasted on to a leaf. By the time a play had been on the stage a year or two challenge would become less probable, and the fact that it had been licensed for printing should have been an ample answer. Even that grasping person, Sir Henry Herbert, asked no fee for re-licensing '*The Winter's Tale*' when it was revived, shortly after 1623, and the players reported the

original manuscript as missing. On the other hand, it is intrinsically probable that, for obtaining the original licence to print, production of the signed manuscript would have been helpful even in Elizabeth's day, while in the next century this was probably indispensable.

On the whole, then, it seems reasonable to believe that in the case of a play printed after having been regularly entered in the Stationers' Register there is a high probability that a prompt-copy would be supplied to the printer; and there is a further high probability that such a prompt-copy would be the manuscript handed over to the players by the author; and yet a further high probability that this manuscript would be in the author's autograph. The highest probability is only a large fraction of a complete proof, and when three fractions are multiplied together they diminish very rapidly. It would need the odds in each case to be as four to one to leave us at the end of our three probabilities with anything more than an even chance. Perhaps it will be wise not to claim more than this even chance that the text of any given play reached the printer of the Quarto in Shakespeare's autograph; but in view of Heminge and Condell's statement as to the receipt of Shakespeare's 'papers,' the use of other autograph manuscripts for prompt-copies, the evidence that quartos of Shakespeare's plays were based on prompt-copies, and the occurrence of new traces of the prompter's hand in the First Folio text of plays printed from Quartos, there does not seem any reason why we should claim less than this.

It will probably be said that a claim which

invites the belief that even half of the fourteen regularly entered Shakespeare Quartos were set up direct from Shakespeare's autograph manuscripts proves too much, because the texts of these first editions contain too many mistakes to stand in such immediate contact with their source. Not a few of these mistakes would be explained if we may believe, as it has been contended we should, that Shakespeare supplied the players not with revised copies, but with treacherously clean-looking rough ones. We have yet, moreover, to reckon with the Elizabethan printer, and the more closely we study the ways of Elizabethan printers, when employed on dramatic work, the more highly we shall rate his capacity for introducing any number of errors into the text supplied to him.

It has long been a commonplace among the textual critics of Shakespeare that in every Quarto edition subsequent to the First new mistakes are introduced, so that the text becomes progressively worse. In an extreme case, that of a probably hasty reprint of 'Richard II,' taking the acceptance or rejection of a reading by the Cambridge editors as definitely marking it as right or wrong, a second quarto has been found to add about 180 per cent. of new errors to those originally made, so that it is nearly three times as incorrect. The case is exceptional, and it must also be remembered that although reprinting a printed edition is easier, and should therefore give a more correct result than printing from manuscript copy, as a matter of fact the very easiness of their task often made compositors and correctors careless. It is also

possible, or rather certain, that there are mistakes in the First Quartos which, because they leave the line in which they occur still intelligible, no one has suspected. In view, however, of the ceaseless stream of new errors poured into the text as first printed in every new edition, it is not possible to say in the case of an average First Quarto, duly entered on the Stationers' Register, that the blunders in it cannot all been due to the printers, but that we must postulate the intervention of one or more copyists to share the blame. The proved inaccuracy of the printers suffices to account for all the faults.

We are not entirely dependent on the judgment of the Cambridge editors in estimating the blunder-making capacity of these printers. As is well known, in several plays of Shakespeare, and of Ben Jonson and other authors also, individual pages are found in two different states, one with certain errors in them, the other with these errors corrected. Where there is only one, or perhaps two, readings in question, it is possible in some cases that instead of speaking of an error and a correction we ought to speak of a right reading and a corruption, because it is certain that the inking-balls sometimes pulled one or more letters out of the forme, and that mistakes were made by these being incorrectly replaced. More commonly, however, and in some cases quite certainly, we can see that the pressmen had begun printing off a page before it had been fully corrected, and that on the master printer (who in a small printing-house, would usually act as his own corrector) coming in, the press was stopped and his corrections introduced

in all the impressions of the page which remained to be pulled. Now on different impressions of one page of the first quarto of 'Richard II' there are four, and on another as many as five, of these uncorrected and corrected readings. On B verso a word is omitted, a letter is added, and in two cases one word is substituted for another. On B₃ verso a word and a hyphen are omitted, a letter is omitted, one word is substituted for another, and two words caught from a previous line displace two others. That shows us what an Elizabethan compositor could do when his master was out. By the Cambridge standard the number of detected errors in the First Quarto of 'Richard II' is less than one a page. Left to themselves, the compositors were capable of multiplying this four-fold, and we cannot tell how often this happened. That is a gloomy thought, and we are bound to remember that in the case of these two pages in 'Richard II' the corrector did come back before the impression was completed, and was conscientious enough to stop the press to put things right as far as he could. But if any one contends that Elizabethan compositors could not have made the errors found in First Quartos without the help of copyists, it is well to bear in mind these instances of his error-making capacity.

We are thus emboldened to persist in our contention that in some cases Shakespeare's own autograph of a play may have been the copy supplied to its first printer, resting our case now on the four points: (i) that the manuscripts handed to the players were in Shakespeare's autograph; (ii)

that in other cases we find an autograph manuscript used as a prompt-copy; (iii) that at least some of the First Quartos were set up from prompt-copies; (iv) that the proved inaccuracy of the printers allows us to assume an original quite as free from faults as an autograph copy supplied by Shakespeare was likely to be.

FROM THE QUARTOS TO THE FIRST FOLIO.

As regards the period from the first publication of a duly registered Quarto to the appearance of a play in the Folio of 1623, no editor, as far as I am aware, has ever propounded a formal theory that readings which appear for the first time in the later Quartos are based upon either a fresh consultation of the MS. already used, or access to a new one. As will be emphasized in our last paper on 'the Improvers of Shakespeare,' editors have concerned themselves unnecessarily with the readings of the later Quartos and have admitted too many readings from them into their text: but they have done this rather on some muddle-headed plea that it all happened a long time ago, that the particular circumstances are very obscure, and that we must take good where we find it and be thankful, than with any the smallest attempt to show how any new authority was obtained. If an eighteenth century editor had had the courage to say that 'the Printer of the First Edition, fearing that he had not done Justice to the Untutored Charm of his Author, had kept the original MS. by him in the hope of Improving his Performance in

another edition,' some one would doubtless have dealt satisfactorily with that editor before now. Surely he would have been confronted with a conspectus of all the changes introduced into any given second edition, and in the utter impossibility of contending that the performance as a whole had been improved, that it had not on the contrary been in every way worsened and depraved, a confession might have been extracted that the later Quartos could have had no other source for their most plausible readings than the wits of their own printers; for the press-correctors of these Quartos did undoubtedly use their wits in correcting blunders they found in the first editions, and sometimes with good success. The causes, however, of the great bulk of the variants introduced into the later Quartos seem to be those common to all copying and more especially the trick of carrying too many words at a time in the head. It has lately been pointed out to me by a master-printer that this tendency is especially active, and therefore especially dangerous, in reprinting from a printed text, in which the eye easily takes in a whole line at a glance, whereas the setting of the line would be a work of minutes, during which it would be easy for the memory to play tricks with one or more words. Besides these, of course, there are the usual transposition of letters, substitution of one letter for another, and other errors to which careless printers are liable. Not all of the printers of Quartos deserve to be stigmatized as careless: but many of them were very careless indeed.

When we come to the First Folio and begin to

enquire into its relation with the Quartos, we find ourselves confronted with a series of readings which at first sight seem decisive against any new manuscripts having been available for improving the text of these plays. Anyone can make mistakes when he is careless. But when we find old blunders being hidden up by commonplace tinkering instead of the true reading being restored, it seems a fair inference, since the tinkers were obviously wide awake and taking trouble, that the producers of the First Folio were driven to tinker because no other course was possible, i.e. because they had no independent authority at hand by which a real correction could be made.

These cases arise where the text of a First Quarto is sound, but an error has been introduced in the second or some later one, and the reading of the First Folio is obviously a tinkering of this error. A couple of instances of this kind may be quoted from among the examples of progressive corruption cited by Malone in his admirable preface in 1790.

In 1 'Henry IV,' v. iii. 11, Blunt answers the threats of Douglas with the words:

I was not born a yielder, thou proud Scot.

In the Quarto of 1613 the printer substituted for the three syllables 'a yielder' the two syllables 'to yield,' thus producing the unmetrical line:

I was not born to yield, thou proud Scot.

In the First Folio this is mended with absolute

neatness by the substitution of 'haughty' for 'proud,' the line thus becoming

I was not born to yield, thou haughty Scot.

If the Quarto of 1613 had disappeared this reading might have held its own, against that of the First Quarto, as a genuine alternative obtained from a new manuscript. But with the nine-syllabled line already in evidence in the Quarto of 1613 we can see that the line has been cleverly botched, and that instead of suggesting the existence of an alternative manuscript, it is strong evidence that no authoritative text was available, and therefore botching had to be resorted to.

Again in the first Quarto of 'Richard III,' 1. i. 63-65, Richard assures Clarence:

'Tis not the king that sends you to the Tower:
My lady Grey his wife, Clarence, 'tis she
That tempers him to this extremity.

In the last of these lines the later quartos substituted the monosyllable 'tempts' for the dissyllable 'tempers,' thus reducing it to

That tempts him to this extremity.

In the Folio the line is eked out to its proper length by the interpolation of an adjective, giving us:

That tempts him to this harsh extremity.

With the history of the line before him no one can doubt that this is botching or tinkering, and it is a perfectly sound inference that the botcher

or tinker in question cannot have had easy access to a manuscript recording the true reading, or he would not have cudgelled his brains with this sorry result.

We must not, however, underrate the complexity of the problem with which we are dealing.

Where a duly registered quarto had been published, the text of the First Folio was usually, though not always, set up from the latest edition of this on the market, this being of course the easiest and cheapest way of supplying the printer with copy.

But in almost every case the Folio text supplies a number of new readings, which, like most other things in the world, may be quite accurately classified under the three headings good, bad, and indifferent.

By a 'Good' reading in this classification is meant a reading undoubtedly Shakespeare's. By a 'Bad' reading, one that is undoubtedly not Shakespeare's, but either belongs to the class of the Folio readings botched up out of the errors of the later Quartos at which we have just been looking, or is an obvious misprint. Lastly, 'Indifferent' readings are those which may be a little better æsthetically than their alternatives, or a little worse; but which, because they make sense and grammar and scan, and crop up mostly in what may be called the lower levels of Shakespeare's verse, we cannot treat as impossible, while it is equally clear that we cannot treat them as possessing any certainty in their own right. If we can find ground for believing that the text of any play first printed in quarto

was revised *as a whole* by the aid of a good manuscript, then for these indifferent readings we must follow the text of the Folio. If on the other hand no such revision took place, then we must print them as they stand in the First Quarto.

If in the case of a given play we are to suppose that a good manuscript existed and was used in improving the text of the late Quarto, who are we to suppose had the manuscript entrusted to him and used it for this purpose?

We may rule out of consideration the person, or persons, whom we may think of as exercising its general editorship. Their task must have been to get together the material, decide what was to be printed and what not, settle the order of the plays, and carry through two specific bits of work, which required special knowledge—the division of the plays into acts and scenes and the substitution, where necessary, of descriptive notes for the imperatives of the old stage-directions. They did not complete either of these jobs—Parts 2 and 3 of ‘King Henry VI’ seem to have been sent to the printer without any general editing of this kind whatever, several plays are only divided into acts, not into scenes, and imperative stage-directions are found sporadically—and as the general editors obviously could not find time to attend to this business, it is impossible to imagine that they had the time or the patience to attend to the collation of the text.

It is quite clear that hired aid must have been called in and that the work done by these hired helpers must have been accepted as final. That is

to say, if any better text, manuscript or printed, was used in preparing that of the late Quarto for the press, the hired man corrected a copy of the late Quarto by this with as much care and skill as he had to bestow, and the copy so corrected became the sole authority for the new text. Very probably the hired man was not engaged for proof-reading; but even if he had been, it would have been out of keeping with the whole atmosphere which surrounds the publication of Shakespeare's plays, if he had discarded the copy for which he himself was responsible, and read the proofs with the better authority which he had collated. Hence, whether the hired man of our (not unreasoned) imagination, or the press-corrector in Jaggard's printing-house had the last word in the matter, if a line were faulty in the copy prepared for press, the choice would be between leaving it as it was and the gross botching of which instances have been given.

In the case of some plays the question to be solved may finally take the form, How far may we reasonably push our belief in the incompetence of the collator in order to explain a few good readings being introduced into the Folio text along with a crowd of bad ones? Sooner than postulate an inhumanly incompetent collator, it might be well to consider whether no source existed from which isolated good readings might be derived without any new manuscript having been available. If we can conceive of the prompter of the Globe Playhouse making haphazard manuscript corrections on his prompt-copy, we may find

in this a source of exactly the kind we want. There is ample evidence (some of it has been quoted) that copies of the printed Quartos were used in the Playhouse as prompt-copies, and that these prompt-copies were used in preparing the Folio text, with the result that some of their manuscript stage-directions got into print. If a prompter could annotate a printed quarto with additional stage-directions for his own use, there seems no reason why he should not have brought the text of his copy into some kind of occasional conformity with any variations made by the actors whom he had to prompt. The actors would presumably still have at their disposal the original acting-parts. In so far as they had learnt these correctly they would restore true readings which the First Quarto had corrupted. In so far as they had not learnt their parts correctly they would from imperfect memory make mistakes very similar to those made by printers from trying to carry too many words at a time in their heads. In the first instance (if the prompter was interested) we have an explanation of the appearance of two or three good readings in the Folio text where nothing else suggests that recourse had been had to any new authority. In the second instance (again if the prompter was interested) we may perhaps find a means for transferring to other shoulders some of the blame for the frequent substitution of one word for another which now, if we refuse to postulate a new manuscript, rests with the printer of the Folio.

If such an hypothesis as has here been sketched

were accepted, the number of plays first printed in Quarto, for which we should have to call in new manuscript authority to account for the Folio text, would be small indeed. It is, however, no part of the bibliographer's work to poach on literary preserves as regards individual plays. Our business is to try to think out in terms of pieces of paper what must have happened for a reading which can be accepted as Shakespeare's to have got into the printed text, subsequently to the First Edition. In view of the licence which Elizabethan printers allowed themselves, we must refuse to invoke manuscript authority for any changes, right or wrong, which might easily originate with the printer—with his common sense or ingenuity, if the changes may be adjudged right, with his very conspicuous carelessness if they are wrong. In the same spirit of economy we must refuse to assume the availability of a manuscript for the revision of the whole text of a play, unless adequate evidence is forthcoming that the whole text was in fact revised. As a way of escape from such extravagance the alternative has here been proposed of haphazard corrections on a printed prompt-copy. But it must be constantly borne in mind that different plays may have had different fortunes. We are bound to suppose that the players as a rule took the cheapest and safest course; but it would be rash indeed to assume that they did so invariably, and that an additional transcript was never made and preserved and came in useful in 1623. All we have tried to do in this paper is to think out the problem in general terms, and trust the

226 MANUSCRIPTS OF SHAKESPEARE.

application to Shakespeare's editors, who hitherto have left the bibliographical side of the problem—the passing from hand to hand of pieces of paper—very imperfectly developed. On these lines we submit that it is bibliographically probable that some of the First Quarto Editions of Shakespeare's plays were printed from the author's own autograph manuscript, which had previously been used as a prompt-copy; that the actors replaced their manuscript prompt-copy by a copy of the printed Quarto, which in its turn received additional stage-directions and also readings representing some of the variants which were adopted by individual actors; that in 1622 a copy of the last Quarto on the market was sent to the playhouse to be roughly collated with the printed prompt-copy; and that the copy so corrected was the source of the Folio text of a normal play originally printed in a duly registered Quarto.

It may be added that in November, 1915, when this paper was read as a Sanders Lecture at Cambridge, I was applying this theory to the case of Shakespeare's 'King Richard II'; readers of the introduction to the facsimile of the unique copy of the third Quarto owned by Mr. W. A. White, of New York ('A New Shakespeare Quarto,' London, Quaritch, 1916), must judge with what success.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

SOME SEVENTEENTH CENTURY SUSSEX TRACTS.

THE Sussex Tracts about which I am to write are scarce, and little known, and I hope that though I can do little more than recite their titles, these will be found quaint enough to arouse the reader's interest.

These books date back to the days when Sussex was still a greatly wooded county, 'full,' as Camden tells us, 'of iron mines . . . in sundry places, where for the making and fineing whereof there bee furnaces on every side': to days when the impassable state of the roads led to the suggestion that the cause of 'the women and all other animals' being so long-legged in Sussex was to be found in the difficulty they experienced 'of pulling the feet out of so much mud by the strength of the ankle.'

A pamphlet of great interest, which has now become extremely scarce, was published in 1614. It dealt with the famous dragon said to harry the Forest of St. Leonards, near Horsham, and bears the following elaborate title:

True and wonderful: a discourse relating to a strange and monstrous serpent (or dragon) lately discovered and yet living to the great annoyance and divers slaughters both of men and Cattell by his strong and violent poyson

228 SOME SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

in Sussex, two miles from Horsham, in a wood called St. Leonard's Forest, and thirty miles from London, this present month of August 1614, with the true generation of Serpents. By A. R.

The old spectre of St. Leonard's Forest was a very real one even in the days of our grandfathers. Mark Antony Lower, writing as late as 1861, states that 'the belief in monstrous serpents lurking among the woods of the weald of Sussex was not quite extinct in my boyhood'; he also goes on to say that this belief can possibly be traced through the middle ages to the period of Scandinavian and Teutonic romance. In 1614, when our pamphlet was published, the county was still largely in the condition of forest growth, and even then it may possibly have been to the advantage of the woodmen and foresters, as at a later date it was to that of the smugglers and highwaymen, to circulate 'true and wonderful' tales of dragons and spirits, with the object of keeping away too inquisitive folk. This pamphlet was reprinted in the Harleian Miscellany in 1808.

The fierce theological controversies that raged during the seventeenth century were responsible for the appearance of a number of tracts or pamphlets dealing with disputed tenets of faith. Many of these are of great local interest and have become extremely rare. Although the titles are somewhat lengthy they are often worth giving in detail.

In 1655, Mathew Caffin, a native of Horsham and afterwards a Baptist minister in the same place, had a theological encounter with a Quaker named Thomas Lawson, formerly a clergyman in Lanca-

shire, as the outcome of which Lawson published, in 1655, his 'An untaught teacher witnessed against.' Matthew Caffin retorted the following year with a tract entitled:

The deceived and deceiving Quakers discovered, their damnable heresies, horrid blasphemous mockings, railings unparalleled deceit and dishonesty laid open.

Lawson must have been rather overcome by this crushing reply from his opponent, for he left it to one James Naylor to reply. Caffin continued his charges against the Quakers, and was himself several times prosecuted under the Conventicle Act.

Richard Haines, of Southwater, near Horsham, who was condemned by Caffin for his worldly invention of an improved method of treating clover, and afterwards excommunicated by him, published in 1671 a tract entitled:

New Lords, new Laws; or a discovery of a grand usurpation in opposition to the Holy Laws of God and contempt of good Laws and Royal Prerogatives of the supreme magistrate, as it hath been lately preached by our Lordly Matthew Caffin, a pretended true apostle of our Beloved Lord and Saviour, and Ruling head of his Congregation usually meeting at South water, near Horsham.

This pamphlet drew from Caffin a retort entitled 'Envy's Bitterness Corrected with a Rod of Shame,' which was published in the same year. This was followed in 1675 by another pamphlet from the pen of Haines, entitled 'A Protestation against

Usurpation.' Caffin replied with his 'A raging wave foaming out his own shame; or an answer to a book lately published by Richard Haines entitled "A protestation against usurpation."' The latter's final appeal against Caffin's persecution and excommunication was an 'Appeal to the General Assembly of Dependent Baptists,' 1680. All these pamphlets are extremely rare; I believe the only known copy of the last mentioned is in the British Museum, and the only copies of 'New Lords, New Laws,' and Caffin's two books 'Envy's Bitterness' and 'A Raging Wave,' are in the Bodleian Library.

In addition to the pamphlets which were the outcome of his encounter with Caffin, Haines wrote several others, some of which dealt with social questions of his time, and were given such modern-sounding titles as 'The prevention of poverty,' 'Provision for the Poor,' and 'A model of Government.' He also published a pamphlet on the woollen industry and another on cider-making. None of these, however, is of such interest as those previously mentioned.

About the time of the Caffin and Haines theological controversy another fierce one raged between Ambrose Rigge, a Quaker, who, in spite of imprisonments and whippings, was a persistent preacher in the South of England, and Leonard Letchford, the intruded vicar of Hurstpierpoint.

Through the instigation of Letchford, Rigge was sent to Horsham Gaol, ostensibly for refusing the oath of allegiance, and during the seven years he remained there the following tracts, setting

forth the wrongs brought on him by the action of Letchford, appeared.

A pamphlet by Leonard Letchford, published in 1663, bore the title:

Whether to do good and not to commit sin be a perfection that any man dares challenge whilst he lives on earth, or whether it be possible for any man so to keep God's commandments and to observe his righteous laws as to say any day I have not offended, I have not need to say forgive me in anything I have done amiss. This was the question by which I struck the Devil dumb in the Quakers Oracle at Horsham known to the world by the name of Ambrose Rigge. Lord open his lips that his mouth may shew forth thy praise in saying plainly it cannot be done. September 1663.

Letchford's pious prayer that the mouth of 'the Devil' might be opened, seems to have been very literally answered if we can judge by the titles of the pamphlets that came from Rigge in reply to his indictment. The first of these was entitled:

The difference between the true gosple and the false truly stated and clearly demonstrated, that all people may see and read which Gospel they have received and obeyed these many years, whether the true gospel or false. Here followeth a few questions, queries put to Leonard Letchford either to be answered in plain scripture according as I have answered his before cited or else to acknowledge that I have struck the Devil dumb in his minister at Hurst, though I have long suffered him to boast himself as though he were a minister of Christ, even till his fruits are grown so foul and odious that every one is ready to bring in their verdict to the contrary. Written by him who hath suffered under Leonard Letchford's cruelty these fifteen months in the county gaol for the testimony of a good conscience, whose name is Ambrose Rigge, 1663.

232 SOME SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

In the same year Rigge unsuccessfully addressed a letter to the King appealing against his imprisonment and promising faith and allegiance. It 1665 another tract, dating 'From the prison in Horsham in Sussex, this 12th. day of the 6th. month called August 1665,' was entitled:

A lamentation over England because of the judgement that is now appearing against her for her manifold transgressions.

Probably the last pamphlet written by Rigge during his confinement in Horsham prison was one relating to tithes, and bearing the title:

The good old way which our ancestors, the most ancient Christians that ever were upon the earth, walked in, and witnessed unto the loss of their lives and liberties. 1669.

Copies of several of these pamphlets of Rigge's are to be seen in the Friends' Library in Devonshire House, Bishopsgate Street. In addition to these he also wrote a number of other controversial addresses, but the only one of special Sussex interest was one addressed to Parliament in 1659, and concerned with the conduct of Sussex priests.

William Chillingworth, the celebrated seventeenth century theologian and author of 'The religion of Protestants a safe way of Salvation,' 1637, was also the cause of a very remarkable book published in 1644 by Francis Cheynell, vicar of Petworth. Chillingworth, who had joined the Royal Army in 1643, accompanied the troops to Arundel Castle, where he was taken ill. He was afterwards one of the prisoners who fell into the

hands of Waller when the castle surrendered. His illness being of so serious a nature he was not removed to London with his fellow prisoners, but was allowed to go to Chichester and lodged in the Bishop's Palace, where he died on 30th January, 1643-44. He was buried in Chichester Cathedral. Francis Cheynell, the incumbent of Petworth, had for some months prior to Chillingworth's death, although treating him with great personal kindness, carried on an incessant theological dispute with him. He was largely instrumental in procuring for him the rites of Anglican burial, yet refused to perform the service, but, though refusing 'to bury his body he thought it very fitting to bury his book,' and appeared at the funeral carrying a copy of 'The Religion of the Protestants,' which, after denouncing the book and its author, he threw into the open grave with the words:

Get thee gone then thou cursed book which has seduced so many precious souls; get thee gone thou corrupt rotten booke, earth to earth, and dust to dust, get thee gone into the place of rottenesse, that thou mayst rot with thy author and see corruption.

Cheynell shortly afterwards wrote a book of his own, in which he gives his version of the above proceedings and the events which led up to them. It bears the title:

Chillingworthi Novissima; or The Sicknesse, Heresy, Death and Buriall of William Chillingworth (in his own phrase) Clerk of Oxford, and in the conceit of his fellow-soldiers, the Queen's Arch-Engineer and Grand-Intelligencer. Set forth in a Letter to his Eminent and learned

234 SOME SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

friends; a relation of his apprehension at Arundell, a discovery of his errors in a Briefe Catechism and a short oration at the Buriall of his Hereticall Book.

A copy is in the Public Library at Brighton.

In addition to these and other theological publications, so typical of the narrowness and bigotry of the time, a number of Civil War tracts were published. Some of these are of great interest, especially one which appeared in connection with the rising of the Clubmen in Sussex. The Clubmen were, as the name implies, bodies of untrained countrymen, armed only with clubs or any old weapons they could lay their hands upon. The object they alleged was the protection of their private property from being plundered, whether by Royalists or Parliament men. On 18th and 19th September, 1645, a thousand Clubmen met near Chichester, and at this gathering a further meeting was arranged to take place the following week near Arundel. The project, however, came to the ears of Cromwell's captains, and Major Young with about fifty men marched to the headquarters of the Clubmen at Walberton, early on the morning of the gathering, and after a faint resistance on the part of the band, dispersed them. An eye-witness of the occurrence describes the proceedings in a pamphlet entitled:

A true relation of the rising of the Clubmen in Sussex, as it was related to William Lenthall Esq.: Speaker to the Honorable House of Commons, by an eye witness of the same. Published by authority, London: printed for John Field, September 23 1645.

There is a copy of this pamphlet in the British Museum, and another at Brighton.

Mr. Thomas Stanford, in his 'Sussex in the Great Civil War,' 1910, mentions the stranding of a large Spanish vessel at Heene, in January, 1644. To avoid capture by some Dutch men-of-war, she had made either for the harbour of Shoreham or the river Arun, with the result that she ran aground off Worthing. The vessel, which with its cargo was valued at something like £50,000, was promptly taken possession of by Sir William Waller, who had just become Governor of Arundel Castle.

On board the ship were some pictures, one of which—painted by Gerarde de la Valle at Antwerp, portrayed the betrothal of St. Ursula, and intended for the church of Saint Anna at Seville—gave great offence to the Puritans, who considered it to be of political significance. The picture, which was sent to London and exhibited in the Star Chamber, furnished material for a couple of pamphlets or tracts claiming to explain its meaning. The first of these was published at Oxford on 8th July, 1644, and was entitled:

The Sea-Gull, or, the new apparition in the Star-Chamber at Westminster. Being a true and accurate description of a large picture, exposed to public view, lively representing the Story of Conanus and Ursula (taken out of the Golden Legend) most grossly mistaken for His Majesties tendering the Scepter of his Kingdoms into the hands of the Queene and Pope.

The reply to this publication was issued about three weeks later, and was entitled: 'The Sussex

236 SOME SEVENTEENTH CENTURY

picture: or an answer to the Sea-Gull. London: printed by F. N. July 29 1644.' Copies of both these pamphlets are in the Thomason Collection of Tracts in the British Museum.

A book, written by Colonel John White, entitled: 'The first century of Scandalous Malignant Priests,' was published in 1643; which, while not dealing solely with the county, is of considerable local interest, for some dozen of the entries relate to dispossessed incumbents of Sussex.

The adventures and escape of King Charles II after the Battle of Worcester, and his journeying through various parts of the country until his final escape from the coast of Sussex, led to the appearance of several tracts and pamphlets relating to his wanderings.

A book, published in 1660 by Henry Seile, bore the title:

Boscobel: or, the compleat history of the most Miraculous preservation of King Charles II. after the Battle of Worcester: September the 3rd 1651; to which is added *Clastrum regale reseratum*; or, the King's Concealment at Trent.

The book appeared anonymously, but the authorship was generally attributed to Thomas Blount, the author of 'Ancient Tenures.' It has been frequently reprinted.

John Huddleston, a Benedictine monk, and afterwards chaplain to the Queen Dowager, was another of Charles' adherents, and assisted in his escape. When the King was dying, Huddleston heard his confession and administered the last sacraments of

the Roman Church to him. Afterwards he wrote an account of what occurred at the Royal death-bed, and at the end of the book, prefaced by a separate title page, follows :

A summary of Occurences relating to the miraculous Preservation of . . . Charles II. after the defeat of his army at Worcester in 1651. Faithfully taken from the express personal testimony of those two worthy Roman Catholics, Thomas Whitgrave . . . and Mr. John Hudleston, priest.

Dr. Bate, in his 'Elenchus Motuum,' also gives an account of the royal fugitive.

Colonel Gounter's account, although not printed until long after the period with which we deal, can claim mention here, by reason of its great local interest. Colonel Gounter, of Rackton, near Chichester, was largely responsible for effecting the King's escape from Brighelmstone (or Southwick, as many think) to France. Shortly before his death he dictated an account of the King's wanderings and escape. The narrative was afterwards locked away in the secret drawer of an old bureau at Rackton, and it was not until early in the nineteenth century that the manuscript was discovered. It is now in the British Museum.

It was first printed in 1846, and bore the title :

The last Act in the Miraculous Storie of His Mties. Escape, being a true and perfect relation of his Conveyance through many dangers to a safe harbour out of the reach of his tyranicall enemies. By Colonel Gounter, of Rackton, in Sussex, who had the happiness to be instrumental in the business (as it was taken from his mouth by a person of worth a little before his death).

This account has been several times reprinted. Copies of it, and also of Blount's book are in both the Brighton and Worthing Public Libraries; they form the basis of most of the later accounts that have been published.

In addition to the pamphlets and tracts mentioned in this article, a number of Sermons, and certain Acts of Parliament, chiefly relating to the roads and bridges, were published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

These, however, are of very little interest, and it was not until towards the end of the eighteenth century, when the coast towns began to be regarded as fashionable places of resort, that the literature of the county became abundant. Thenceforth to the present day the growth has been steady; and when a detailed bibliography, now in progress, is published, it will be seen that Sussex can claim a much higher rank among the literary counties of England than has hitherto been granted it.

ETHEL GERARD.

IDEALS IN MODERN FRENCH LITERATURE.

ANDRÉ GIDE.

'Le génie, c'est le sentiment de la ressource.'

'Toutes choses sont dites déjà ; mais comme personne n'écoute, il faut toujours recommencer.'

'La nécessité de l'option me fut toujours intolérable ; choisir m'apparaissait non tant élire, que repousser ce que je n'étais pas.'

'On vit si bien sans opinions.'



ANDRÉ GIDE makes no pretensions to preach a new Gospel, nor does he offer a remedy for the relief of man's estate. I have chosen to include him among the exponents of the ideals to be found in modern French literature because only in a French writer would it be possible to find the openness to ideas of every sort, the peculiar kind of impartiality born not of a sense of cold justice, but of a passionate desire that nothing of value shall escape, that colours the whole of Gide's writings. It is his desire ever to go farther, ever to seek for something better, something greater, that attracts us in his work. The elusiveness, the complication of his thought, render it impossible to explain him,

and he would himself be the first to object to any explanation. I can only hope here to trace faintly the path along which he seems to me to wander.

André Gide was born at Paris in 1869, 'd'un père Uzétien et d'une mère Normande.' He was thus compounded of the north and the south, and of both the Catholic traditions of his mother's family and the Protestant traditions of his father's. As he puts it himself:

'Entre la Normandie et le Midi je ne voudrais ni ne pourrais choisir, et me sens d'autant plus Français que je ne le suis pas d'un seul morceau de France, que je ne peux penser et sentir spécialement en Normand ou en Méridional, en catholique ou en protestant, mais en Français, et que né à Paris, je comprends à la fois l'Oc et l'Oïl, l'épais jargon Normand, le parler chantant du midi, que je garde à la fois le goût du vin, le goût du cidre, l'amour des bois profonds, celui de la garrigue, du pommier blanc et du blanc amandier. . . . Si quelque hasard les rapprochait, le paysan normand que je connais et l'homme du midi que je connais, non seulement ne s'aimeraient pas, mais ne pourraient même pas se comprendre. Pourtant ils sont Français tous deux.'

Gide wrote these words in 1902, and we may point to them as significant of the national spirit of France that we see so potent to-day, of the intense love of country that prevails with the whole nation, and renders it strong to endure uncomplainingly the hardships of war, and to regard no sacrifice as too great to preserve and secure its liberty.

Gide's family belonged to the 'vieille bourgeoisie provinciale.' Its members were fond of lofty speculations, and considered intellectual occupations to be

the highest form of work. There prevailed a hatred of everything frivolous, and an elevated idea of duty resulting from Protestant teaching. Although there is always a certain danger in seeing personal history in a novelist's heroes, there is little doubt that in the upbringing of Jérôme in 'La Porte étroite,' Gide is describing his own:

'Cet enseignement austère trouvait une âme préparée, naturellement dispose au devoir, et que l'exemple de mon père et de ma mère, joint à la discipline puritaine à laquelle ils avaient soumis les premiers élans de mon cœur, achevait d'incliner vers ce que j'entendais appeler: la vertu. . . . Je quêtai de l'avenir non tant le bonheur que l'effort infini pour l'atteindre, et déjà confondais bonheur et vertu.'

As he grew up, Gide abandoned this austerity. He yielded to a desire for travel, for seeing men and lands with his own eyes, and not through the spectacles of books. All knowledge, he declared, should be preceded by a sensation.

"'Toi, Jérôme, tu désires voyager?'" "Partout! la vie tout entière m'apparaît comme un long voyage à travers les livres, les hommes, les pays. Songes-tu à ce que signifient ces mots: lever l'ancre? . . . Partir la nuit; se réveiller dans l'éblouissement de l'aurore . . . l'arrivée dans un port que tout enfant déjà on l'avait regardé sur les cartes; où tout est inconnu."

Thus, Gide's early influences made him a seeker in every department of life, and a hater of principles. 'I hate all persons with principles,' he makes one of his heroes exclaim. Such persons, in Gide's eyes, are never sincere, because they only

do what their principles decree. A man should owe his virtue to himself and not to his principles.

Gide's books¹ are so many adventures of the soul; and it must be confessed that, although he is ever seeking, he scarcely seems to know what it is he sets out to seek. He is the most distinguished among a number of French writers who deal with types of men and women who form to themselves exaggerated ideas of duty and virtue, and in avoiding one excess fall into the other, and generally end by making futile sacrifices. They are frightened of life; the obligation to make a choice terrifies them; they fear to take risks, and so miss what would bring happiness. No man can ever be a law unto himself, nor can he divest himself or others of the human feelings common to all. Michel in 'L'immoraliste,' Alissa in 'La porte étroite,' ruin not only their own lives but those nearest and dearest to them. The immoralist is an egoist who, after recovery from a serious illness, makes a fetish of his own health to the exclusion of all besides. His conduct brings about his wife's death, and we leave him unhappy, with the sense—and this is the saving grace—of his own failure.

Alissa believes that virtue means the denying herself everything she desires. She carries out in her life the creed of some of the old puritans that to be virtuous you must be unhappy. She refuses to marry the man she loves because it would

¹ The most important for a first study of Gide are the novels, 'L'Immoraliste' (1902); 'La Porte Étroite' (1909): and the critical works, 'Prétextes, réflexions sur quelques points de littérature et de morale' (1903); 'Nouveaux Prétextes' (1911).

make her too happy and prevent her attaining the 'perfection' at which she has striven from childhood. Virtue, in her eyes, means resistance to love; that the most natural desire of her heart could be a virtue appears to her only a 'sophisme attrayant! invitation spécieuse! mirage malicieux de bonheur!' And she is also troubled by the idea that love of her will prevent Jérôme, her lover, from attaining perfection.

'Il s'attarde à moi, me préfère, et je deviens l'idole qui le retient de s'avancer plus loin dans la vertu.'

And so she prays to God to grant her strength to teach her lover to leave off loving her! She even doubts if she should continue to love him if, in loving her, he sometimes forgot to work for his own 'perfection.' The journal, in which she describes her efforts to tear her lover out of her heart all for his own good, is painful and pathetic reading. But it is only when we have read 'La porte étroite' through to the bitter end that we realize what Gide means when he declares that he hates 'les gens à principes.'

Gide has, as I have said, an elusive personality, and it is only after prolonged and careful study of his books that we begin to discover his philosophy of life. Like Gourmont, he has no ready-made scheme for the relief of man's estate; he sees where evil prevails, but offers no solution. He believes that every man must conquer liberty for himself, and that we need more individuals, that is, more men who differ from others. Communism, the crowd, will accomplish nothing. And for two

reasons. Firstly, on account of the ease with which it can be flattered. A heterogeneous public, come together from everywhere and nowhere, having in common neither culture, tastes, duties, nor ideals, can only be flattered 'en bloc' in what is common to all men, therefore in the most vulgar aspects.

'Réunis, les hommes perdent ce qu'ils ont de précieusement personnel; ils n'additionnent et ne renforcent que ce qu'ils ont "de même nature." . . . La communion ne s'obtient ici que sur les points les plus communs, les plus grossiers et les plus vils.'

Another danger is that the crowd is hungry, it demands food. The old dogmas no longer satisfy it; it insists on new answers to ethical and social questions, but is too uneducated to discriminate the true from the false or specious. The crowd, then, is always anonymous and irresponsible. 'I hate the crowd,' cries Gide,

'elle ne respecte rien; toute tendresse, toute délicatesse, toute justesse, toute beauté s'y faussent, s'y brisent, s'y flétrissent. . . . Je hais la foule;—ne voyez pas d'orgueil dans mes paroles; quand je suis dans la foule, j'en fais partie, et c'est parceque je sais ce que j'y deviens que je hais la foule.'

Progress and improvement are always due to individuals who differ from other individuals. Therefore we should never look askance on, or be afraid of, new things, of strange things, of things outside our experience or our thoughts, of 'nouvelles formes d'art et nouvelles pensées, et quand elles devraient venir de la planète Mars.'

While Gide believes in individuals, he is no friend to the theory of individualism. 'Il n'y a pas d'individualisme qui tienne; les grands individus n'ont nul besoin des théories qui les protègent: ils sont vainqueurs.' There are, however, very few 'grands individus,' and any effort to increase their number can only diminish it: 'tous individus: plus d'individu.' Man is more interesting than men; 'c'est lui et non pas eux Dieu à fait à son image. Chacun est plus précieux que tous.'

In politics, as in other matters, Gide ranges himself on no side. Again he makes no choice. He recognizes, however, that in these days it is impossible absolutely to ignore politics; in fact they lie in wait for us at every turn, and weigh on us without our will or knowledge. Unconsciously our thoughts take on a 'red' or 'white' colour, and we are forced to range ourselves on the side of the 'reds' or the 'whites.' If we sit on the fence, reproaches are hurled at us. Therefore, although with great hesitation, we are sometimes compelled to take up a definite position in regard to politics, and then, immediately, the evil begins. Instead of our opinions dictating our position, it is the position that dictates our opinions. Next we come to judge the opinions of others, and even our own opinions, according to the colour through which we see them: if 'red,' we judge them to be good, sound opinions; if 'white,' they are bad, unsound opinions; or vice versâ. This may be useful to a party, but it is thoroughly harmful to personal judgment. And so Gide ranges himself with no party. He believes, moreover, that a disinterested

opinion is of more real utility than one dictated by a party; indeed, that the only means of keeping thought alive is to leave the opinions free play, and to encourage all sorts. It is this attitude of mind, more encouraged, I think, in France than in this country, that gives breadth to the French genius, and makes it akin to that of ancient Greece. In a fine passage, Gide emphasises the point:

‘Il y a des landes plus âpres que celles de Bretagne; des pacages plus verts que ceux de Normandie; des rocs plus chauds que ceux de la campagne d’Arles; des plages plus glauques que nos plages de la Manche, plus azurées que celles de notre midi—mais la France a cela *tout à la fois*. Et le génie français n’est pour cela même ni tout landes, ni tout cultures, ni tout forêts, ni tout ombre, ni tout lumière—mais organise et tient en harmonieux équilibre ces divers éléments proposés. C’est ce qui fait de la terre française la plus classique des terres; de même que les éléments si divers ioniens, doriens, béotiens, attiques, firent la classique terre grecque.’

Gide’s own work goes to prove that ‘le génie français s’informe et s’enrichit et se précise chaque jour.’

It is already clear, I think, that notwithstanding Gide’s dislike of any fixed opinions, in certain matters to do with art and life he does hold very strong views. For example, he believes in the importance and efficacy of the influence men have one on the other. He is very severe on the notion held by so many young people to-day that they must be careful to keep aloof from anything—books or persons—that may influence them, for fear of injuring their originality. That idea,

curiously enough, is wholly modern; great minds through the ages have never suffered from such a fear.

‘Dans toute grande époque on se contentait d’être personnel, sans chercher à l’être, de sorte qu’un admirable fonds commun semble unir les artistes des grandes époques, et, par la réunion de leurs figures involontaires diverses, créer une sorte de société, admirable presque autant par elle-même, que l’est chaque figure isolée. Un Racine se préoccupait-il de ne ressembler à nul autre? Sa Phèdre est-elle diminuée parce qu’elle naquit, prétend-on, d’une influence janséniste? Le XVII^e siècle français est-il moins grand pour avoir été dominé par Descartes? Shakespeare a-t-il rougi de mettre en scène les héros de Plutarque; de reprendre les pièces de ses prédécesseurs ou de ses contemporains?’

The great man, in desiring to become as human as possible, becomes only the more individual. The man, always a small man, who dreads to be as other men, only succeeds in becoming singular, eccentric, deficient.

Influences are of two sorts, general and particular. In the first division we may place the influences felt at one and the same time by a family, a group of men, a nation, influences that tend to reduce the individual to a common type. In the second are the influences felt only by one individual, voluntarily or involuntarily, consciously or unconsciously, influences that tend to bring the individual into opposition with the community. Yet, all the same, there will be others who have felt similar influences, and these will tend to draw together, and themselves form a group.

The human being does not exist who can say that he has never been influenced by anyone or anything. We read a book, close it, replace it on the shelf, but in the book was a sentence we cannot forget. It has become part of ourselves. We may forget the book in which we read it, or even wholly forget that we have read it, or only remember it imperfectly. No matter! We shall never again be the same as we were before we read it. Now how is the power of this influence to be explained? By the fact that it has merely revealed some part of us hitherto unknown. Thus those who dread influences, and try to avoid them, make a tacit avowal of the poverty of their minds. I remember that on one occasion George Meredith advised a young lady who sent him a story she had written to read, to wait, to read and study the great authors before attempting composition herself. She replied that she wanted to do original and not imitative work, and therefore could not follow his counsel. Meredith then wrote with some severity: 'If hard study should kill your creative effort, it will be no loss to the world or to you. And if, on the contrary, the genius you possess should survive the process of mental labour, it will be enriched and worthy of a good rank.'

The fact, however, that Gide's mind is detached and aloof actually helps him to give an exact and complete image of reality. For there is nothing definite about reality; nothing is complete and finished in itself; everything is in some degree contradicted, compensated, even repaired by a thousand other things. Yet man must have a goal;

as we proceed towards it, we should, while permitting nothing to turn us from it, take heed of everything we pass on the way, 'ces choses marchent et s'en vont; que notre but soit immobile—et nous marcherons pour l'atteindre.' That goal is really God—Gide, of course, uses the term in its broadest sense—we can never lose sight of Him, for He is in everything:

'Nous marcherons vers Lui; . . . avec les œuvres d'art à droit, les paysages à gauche, la route à suivre devant nous;—et faisons-nous maintenant, n'est-ce pas, des âmes belles et joyeuses. Car ce sont nos larmes seulement qui font germer autour de nous les tristesses.'

ELIZABETH LEE.

REVIEWS.

L'Atelier de Guillaume Le Talleur, premier imprimeur rouennais. Histoire et bibliographie. Par Pierre Le Verdier. Ouvrage publié pour la Société française de bibliographie. Rouen, 1916. 4°. pp. 178.

TO a fellow antiquary there is something very inspiring in the appearance at the present time of this fine monograph on the first Rouen printer. The effort of France in the War has necessarily been made more quickly, which means at a far greater cost, than our own. Until the crisis came we did not know either our own strength or our own courage. We believed, and taught other nations to believe, that our military effort could only be a very small one, and because we believed this, though the effort has been started on a grand scale, we are only gradually working up to our maximum, only gradually paying the price which the effort demands. Even now we can hardly feel assured that the whole power of the nation available for the business of war has been brought into the organization for it. So long as this doubt remains antiquarian work may well be suspect, may perhaps, indeed, only be defensible for its export value. But when, as we believe is the case in France, all

is being done that can be done, then 'study as usual,' more especially study dictated by the local patriotism which plays so large a part in building up a healthy national life, falls into its place in the great scheme, helping to maintain that confident composure which is among the best assets in these times of strain. So we welcome the appearance of M. Le Verdier's monograph on the first printer at Rouen as a new instance of the splendid spirit of France, and take a double pleasure in its excellence.

The printing houses of Rouen have always been of interest to English students, because of the number of books printed at them to be marketed here, and that of Le Tellier has especial interest because of its relation with Richard Pynson, the first fine craftsman who printed in England. It has been a little surprising that the craft was so slow in taking root at Rouen, and one of M. Le Verdier's main achievements is that he proves that Le Talleur was at work a good two years earlier than has hitherto been known, thus giving Rouen priority over Tréguier and Abbeville, and possibly also over Rennes. He effects this by proving that an unsigned and undated 'Prologue de l'Entrée de Charles VIII à Rouen' must have come from Le Talleur's press, and must also have been printed and on sale before the entry, which took place in April, 1485, since the author alludes to 'autres choses qu'il descripra après la dicte entrée.' Guillaume Le Talleur himself was a native of Rouen, son of a Laurent Letalleur, of whom a scanty mention has been found. Young Guillaume is here shown very prettily to have received his

training from that fine printer, Jean Dupré of Paris, whose greatness has never received quite the full recognition it deserves, so that such a mere pushing tradesman as Antoine Vérard has been allowed almost to overshadow him. Like a good master Dupré allowed his chief workmen to claim part of the credit for the work with which they had to do by setting their initials to it, and the T. L. which appears at the end of the splendid Paris Missal of 1481, the 'Trésor des humains' of 1482, and the translation of Boccaccio's 'De Casibus' of 1483, is here shown to stand for Le Talleur, not by reversal, as has been suggested, but by taking the initial letters of the two syllables Tal-leur. According to M. Le Verdier, Norman sheep are still marked on this plan, and one of his own ancestors, Jacques Le Verdier, initialled his plate not J. L. V., as we might expect, but J. V. D., where the V. D. stand for Ver-dier.

That Le Talleur was the printer of the 'Prologue de l'Entrée' of 1485 is here argued partly from the family resemblance of its type to some of Du Pré's, partly from a pretty piece of negative reasoning which suggests, rather than proves, that the only other possible claimant, Jean Le Bourgeois, was not at work in that year. We should have laid greater stress on the fact that the type of the 'Entrée' is found in the 'Ordinaire des Crestiens' in conjunction with two other types, Proctor's 4 and 5, which are known for certain to have belonged to Le Talleur by their use in books which bear in one case his mark, in another his device. For this to happen the type of the 'Entrée' must

either have belonged to Le Talleur from the beginning or have been acquired by him subsequently, and the arguments mentioned above seem better suited to giving the preference to the former supposition than as proving by themselves Le Talleur's ownership.

Proctor in his 'Index' assigned to Le Talleur seven types; M. Le Verdier is able to prove his possession of twelve, but with a self-abnegation not common among bibliographers, he has forced his twelve types into Proctor's enumeration, as follows :

Voilà donc dressée la liste des types suivants, révélés et garantis, excepté le dernier, par des livres signés du nom ou de la marque de Le Talleur, et le dernier, attesté par les circonstances de fait et de temps qui ont été exposées au premier chapitre :

Proctor, type 1, Pr. type 2 (*Chroniques*, 1487, signées du nom de Le Talleur).

Type 2 bis (aux *Missels* de Seez, 1488, et du Mans, 1489, signés).

Type 2 ter (aux mêmes).

Type 2 quater (au *Missel* du Mans, 1489, signé).

Proctor type 3 (texte de l'*Ordinaire* pour Jean Richart, marque de Le Talleur).

Proctor type 4 (*Livre des bonnes meurs*, signé; et *Gualterus, Gesta Alexandri magni*, marque).

Proctor type 5 (*Traclatus contra pestilentiam*, marque).

Proctor type 6 (têtes de ligne des *Tenores novelli*, signé).

Proctor type 7 (petit caractère anglais, *Tenores novelli*, signé).

Type 8 (titre du *Bréviaire* de Rouen pour Jean Richart, marque).

Type 9 (*Entrée de Charles VIII.*, avril 1485, sans nom, ni marque).

It will be observed that sooner than dethrone Proctor's type 1 from its pride of place, M. Le Verdier brings the type which should precede it right to the end of his list as type 9, and interpolates the types which should be called 4, 5 and 6 at the expense of having to call them by the clumsy names, 2 bis, 2 ter, 2 quater. The chivalry of this is so delightful that we take off our hat to it, though we are quite clear that it is mistaken. Proctor's wonderful achievement was that he mapped out in tentative chronological sequences the whole printing material of the fifteenth century, so far as he knew it. It was an extraordinary piece of pioneer work, but it is the glory of the pioneer to enable his successors to attain to fuller knowledge, and Proctor has his best monument in the fact that students of fifteenth century printing all over Europe take his lists of types as their starting-point and are then able to produce better ones from the great mass of details which can only be available in the country of origin. When a final monograph, as this of M. Le Verdier must be reckoned in the case of Le Talleur, is produced, the types should be arranged in their sequence as finally determined, and Proctor, though he would have been profoundly touched by the deference shown to his pioneer list, would have been the first to demand that it should be scrapped. It cannot really be good that the earliest type of a printer who used altogether a dozen different founts should be permanently called Type 9.

While M. Le Verdier has increased the seven types of Le Talleur known to Proctor to twelve, he

has increased the seven books ascribed to Le Talleur in Burger's Index to no fewer than thirty-one. Here is his list of the first thirty of them :

1. [avril 1485] *Prologue de l'Entrée de Charles VIII.* à Rouen, type 9.
2. Ricardus de Radulphis, *Defensorium curatorum*, type 9.
3. *Ordinaire des crestiens*, types 9, 4 et 5.
4. Jean de Gerson, *De eruditione confessorum*, type 9.
5. Jean de Gerson, *Traſtatus de probatione spirituum*, type 9.
6. 1487. *Chroniques de Normandie*, mai 1487, types 1 et 2.
7. 1487. *Chroniques de Normandie*, 14 mai 1487, type 1.
8. 1488. *Missel de Seez*, types 2 bis et 2 ter.
9. 1489. *Missel du Mans*, types 2 bis, 2 ter et 2 quater.
10. *Tenores novelli*, types 2 bis, 4, 6 et 7.
11. Statham's *Abridgement*, types 2 bis, 4, 6 et 7.
12. Th. Forestier, *Traſtatus contra pestilentiam*, types 2 bis et 5.
13. Nic. de Lyre, *Preceptorium in decalogum*, types 2 bis et 5.
14. Gualterus ou Gautier, *Gesta Alexandri magni*, types 2 bis et 4.
15. Jacques Le Grant, *Le livre des bonnes meurs*, type 4.
16. Jean Laillier, *Libellus secundum veritatem*, type 4.
17. St. Bonaventure, *Meditationes de vita Christi*, type 4.
18. *Vocabularius familiaris*, type 4.
19. Jean de Gerson, *De pollutionibus*, type 4.
20. Jean de Gerson, *De regulis mandatorum*, type 4.
21. Piere d'Ailly, *Traſtatus de legibus*, type 4.
22. Jean de Gerson, *Opus tripartitum*, type 4.
23. Jean de Gerson, *Traſtatus adversus observatores dierum*, etc., type 4.
24. Jean de Gerson, *Astrologia theologisata*, type 4.
25. Guillelmus parisiensis, *Traſtatus de vocatione ad beneficia*, type 4.
26. Jean de Gerson, *Traſtatus de meditatione cordis*, type 4.
27. Jean de Gerson, *Traſtatus de simplificatione cordis*, type 4.

28. *Droits et établissements de Normandie*, type 4.
 29. *Ordinaire des crestiens*, pour Jehan Richart, types 2 bis,
 3 et 5.
 30. *Bréviaire de Rouen*, pour Jehan Richart, types 2 bis et 8.

To this he adds in an appendix :

31. *Traité de paix et de mariage entre le roi Louis xi. et Maximilien d'Autriche* (24 Dec. 1482). Types 4 et 9.

Some of the additions, like this last, are new discoveries; of others the existence has been known, but their typographical authorship is now for the first time revealed. The net result is greatly to increase Le Talleur's importance.

Before taking leave of M. Le Verdier's fine book we must make one more quotation from it, because it throws light on that struggle between scribes and printers which we know must have been fought out, but of which so few details are available. The passage is part of M. Le Verdier's argument to prove that Jean Le Bourgeois cannot have been the printer of the 'Entrée,' and it shows us the supersession of manuscript by print in the annual production of the briefs or permits to eat butter during Lent, to the pecuniary acknowledgments of which by the faithful the Butter Tower of Rouen Cathedral owes its existence.

Ces brevets qui avaient pour objet d'accorder des adoucissements aux rigeurs du jeûne moyennant des aumônes en faveur de l'église cathédrale¹ se distribuaient chaque

¹ La tour méridionale de la cathédrale de Rouen, dite la tour de Beurre, tire son nom de ce qu'elle aurait été construite, au moins en partie, avec le produit de ces aumônes.

année dans les seize cents paroisses du diocèse. Or ils étaient écrits à la main. Dans le compte de la fabrique de la cathédrale qui s'étend de la Saint-Michel 1484 à la Saint-Michel 1485, on voit qu'ils sont encore manuscrits et payés à Guillaume ou Guillebert Pouchet, à raison de deux deniers l'un. Les comptes de 1485 à 1487 manquent. Celui de Saint-Michel 1487 à Saint-Michel 1488 porte paiement à Gaillard le Bourgeois pour des brevets imprimés: 'à Gaillard Le Bourgeois, pour deux milliers et demy de brevez fais pour le burre, envoyez aux doyens et curez pour recommander la fabrique, payé par marchié faict, à cent sous le milier, la somme de 12 livres 10 sous.' La même commande n'a-t-elle pas été faite à Le Bourgeois les deux années précédentes? D'abord pour priver Le Talleur de son antériorité, il faudrait faire la preuve contre lui. Mais il semble bien que c'est pour la première fois que sont imprimées en 1488 (n.s.) ces menues feuilles volantes: comme on ne veut pas rompre en effet tout de suite avec le vieux fournisseur, on paie en cette même année à 'maistre Guillebert Pouchet, prebtre, pour avoir escript 1037 brevets en parchemin, à deux deniers chacun, 8 livres, 12 sous, 10 deniers.' Au compte suivant, Saint-Michel 1488 à Saint-Michel 1489, Pouchet figure encore une fois: 'à Guillaume Pouchet, pour sa paine d'avoir escript 1152 brevets en parchemin, au prix de deux deniers tournois le brevet,' et l'on n'y trouve pas de brevets imprimés. Enfin le compte de 1489 à 1490 mentionne les deux fournisseurs: 'à maistre Guillebert Pouchet pour sa paine d'avoir écrit en parchemin 240 brevets à deux deniers le brevet.' Le pauvre homme, c'est pour son adieu, semble-t-il, car le lot est maigre et dans la suite il n'émerge plus. Et en même temps s'inscrit le paiement 'à Gaillart Bourgoys, libratier' pour achat de cinq milliers de brevets imprimés pour recommander la fabrique. 'Item ledit Gaillart en a donné encore un millier pour ce qu'il a tenu un étal à vendre livres près la porte de l'église.'

The record shows us Jean Le Bourgeois, through his kinsman Gaillard, quickly ousting the poor priest Guillebert Pouchet from his old domain, and the sympathy which runs through M. Le Verdier's narrative is good to recognize. A. W. P.

Indian Thought, Past and Present. By R. W. Frazer, LL.B., C.E., I.C.S. (Ret.). T. Fisher Unwin. London. 8°. pp. 339.

When this war is over, and a readjustment of political and social relations is being developed, among the most important of these for the British Government will be the defining of the future status of the Indian Empire in its relations to England, to the self-governing colonies, and to other nations. In order that this may be advantageous to those who most deserve it, a careful study of the traditions, thoughts, and conditions of the many peoples of India is absolutely necessary. As an aid to the rightful study of these, the views of a writer, who has devoted many years of his life in India to these studies, should be invaluable. Mr. R. W. Frazer in his 'Indian Thought, Past and Present,' has in a few hundred pages summarised the salient points of the 'wisdom of the ages,' extracted with much thought and discrimination from the vast masses of oriental literature.

He traces the rise and progress of Hindu thought from the advent of the Aryan race unto the Punjab, when the fathers of the nomad families were also the high priests, and offered sacrifice and prayer at the family altars to the

deities whose spirits were embodied in the powers of nature; the sun, the wind, and the rain. He shows next the evolution of the doctrine of One all pervading Soul, or First Cause, with its triune emanations Brahma, Vishnu and Siva, on one side; and of the numerous anthropomorphic gods, avatars, incarnations, on the other. Round each of these accumulated numerous legends, which in time were incorporated in one thousand hymns, the Rig Veda, and the family priests, into whose hands sacerdotal functions had fallen, while the Kshatriyas were busy fighting and conquering, became an hereditary caste, the sole depositories and exponents of the sacred writings, and as such obtained ecclesiastical domination. Struggles to throw off this domination caused the rise of Buddhism, Jainism and other reforming sects, that for some centuries threatened the supersession of Hinduism in its Brahminical form, but were eventually overcome by Hindu reaction and suppressed. Sacerdotalism regained its lost supremacy over the multitude and has since retained it, in spite of the advent of Islam and Christianity, and the spread of western scientific knowledge and social ideas. The high caste educated Indian will not trouble to contradict these facts, he will, in college, work out the correct dates of the eclipses from calculations based on the distances, forms and motions of the earth and moon; then go home and offer propitiatory sacrifices and prayers to the demon who is swallowing the sun or moon, and give gifts to Brahmins and Sweepers.

In the last two chapters Mr. Frazer discusses the

position of women in India, and present Indian thought. In the former he shows us how the honourable position and freedom accorded to women in Vedic times, has been altered and curtailed under Brahminical influence. How it is now considered her first duty to marry and produce a son to inherit the family property and perform funeral rites for his father. If unsuccessful she should beg her husband to take another wife for the purpose. Her whole life should be one of devotion and abject submission to her husband, whatever his faults. The better to ensure this, some fraudulent commentator by the alteration of a word in the early writings, made it the duty of the high caste widow to become *Satti*, that is to immolate herself on the funeral pyre of her husband. Her freedom was curtailed by the adoption of the *purdah* system, from dread of the Moslem invaders. Modern reformers have boldly preached against child marriage and the *Purdah*, and advocated female education. But the educated Bengali press fiercely opposed the 'Age of Consent Bill,' and expresses unstinted admiration when some poor child widow in Bengal, from superstition, or fear of the widow's lot, commits suicide on the death of her, possibly only still betrothed, husband. Though the *purdah* system appears repugnant to western ideas, in the present state of Indian society, it has also its advantages; and Mr. Frazer quotes the appreciative remarks of Lady Dufferin. One may conceive that a vicereine visiting noble families would see only the brighter side, yet with all its faults Hindu ladies of rank would resent the

sudden withdrawal of the curtain screening their home life as a gross outrage on their modesty. The amelioration of woman's lot must come from within the purdah. Female education is spreading, especially among the higher and the trading and banking communities. A knowledge of literature and an acquaintance with all that is happening in the outer world is not uncommon in the Zenana, and the influence of women is very powerful.

In the study of present thought in India too much stress is apt to be laid on the speeches and writings of the 'English educated' that is, largely, the professional classes. It is not sufficiently realised that these form an infinitesimal section of the three hundred millions of India, and seldom have any knowledge of the agricultural masses. Their ideas are also antagonistic to the traditions and opinions of the best of the princes and nobles, and of the most influential sections of the Brahmins. The soldiers of the Indian army were delighted to join their British comrades in Europe. Only a section of the so-called 'English educated' community demand political concessions as rewards.

If India is to have a representative Assembly, care should be taken that it contains men who truly represent the various classes who have shown their loyalty by their deeds. In Mr. Frazer's words, 'England as an Empire has patiently and consistently carried on the work which destiny has entrusted to her.' She will continue to do so only if she studies the real thoughts of the best, rather than the most fluent, of India's intellectual heritage from the past.

J. Y. W. MACA.

Library of Congress. Guide to the Law and Legal Literature of Spain. Prepared under the direction of Edwin M. Borchard, Law Librarian, by Thomas W. Palmer, Jr. Washington: Government Printing Office. 1915. Price 50 cents.

When the United States of America acquired the Philippines they were naturally brought into closer contact with Spanish law than at any previous time, and several valuable translations of Spanish law books were soon produced. These are now followed by this excellent 'Guide,' which is so arranged that the table of contents enables the student to find in a moment the pages where the particular kind of law he is in search of is dealt with. Its object is stated to be 'first, to furnish the lawyer and the student of comparative law with information as to the private and public law of the country; secondly, to acquaint the legislator with the recent development of legislation, particularly that designed to meet the social and economic problems of the day; and, thirdly, to furnish the jurist and historian with a guide to the contributions to the history, theory, and the philosophy of law.' Mr. Borchard acknowledges much valuable help from the leading authorities in Spain, such as Giner de los Rios, Altamira, and the Marqués de Olivart, and we shall probably not be far wrong in attributing to them the timely warnings in the text respecting books which are not accepted as authorities.

Spain, whether in the condition of one kingdom, or of the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon, or of

the still earlier provinces, has always been a great maker of laws, and consequently there is much complexity in the system, and great difficulty in reconciling the general law of the country with the customary laws of the various regions. As the author well remarks (p. 45): 'The Supreme Court at Madrid passes in the last instance, upon appeals from the whole of Spain, thus causing the influence of Castilian law to be felt throughout the Peninsula. The doctrines of these decisions are having some harmonizing effect in the conflict of the code with the foral law.'

As Spain was the first great colonizing country of modern Europe, her colonial laws, and especially those dealing with the Indians, are of great interest. And here it may be remarked that the failure of Spain in the administration of her vast colonial empire was not the result of any lack of good laws and excellent 'royal orders,' but was to a large extent due to faulty administrators, lay and ecclesiastical, who reproduced some of the worst characteristics of the Roman proconsuls. Special attention may be called to the section dealing with the literature of labour laws. Spain being chiefly an agricultural country, where mills and factories have developed very slowly, it is only during the last twenty or thirty years that strikes and labour problems have disturbed its serenity, but the number and character of the books show the importance which the subject has at once assumed, and already there are several collections of the texts of the labour laws conveniently annotated.

When mentioning the monograph of Langle

Rubio on woman in criminal law (p. 96), it is pointed out that he devotes considerable space 'to the desertion of children which, since the Middle Ages, has been one of the crying sins of the country, and has multiplied the number of foundling hospitals to an incredible extent.' This is a particularly interesting reference for the student of Spanish literature, as the allusions to foundlings and foundling hospitals are very frequent.

It is to be hoped that no one will judge the scholarship of this book from the glossary and index, which appear to be the work of a different hand. The former is watered down by the inclusion of an inordinate number of common words with their common meanings, while many important special meanings are omitted (e.g. *residencia*); the latter is disfigured by such references as 'Maria combronero' for the Manuel Maria Cambronero of the text; 'Instituto de Ibero-Americano' for the Instituto Ibero-Americano; 'Armas' for Armas y Saenz; 'Mas' for Más y Monzó, etc., etc.

G. F. B.